arXiv:1608.05110v1 [math.GT] 17 Aug 2016

SYMPLECTICALLY REPLACING PLUMBINGS WITH EULER CHARACTERISTIC 2 4-MANIFOLDS

JONATHAN SIMONE

Abstract. A 2-replaceable linear plumbing is defined to be a linear plumbing whose lens space boundary, equipped with the canonical contact structure inherited from the standard contact structure on S^3, has a minimal strong symplectic filling of Euler characteristic 2. A 2-replaceable plumbing tree is defined in an analogous way. In this paper, we classify all 2-replaceable linear plumbings, build some families of 2-replaceable plumbing trees, and use one such tree to construct a symplectic exotic $\mathbb{C}P^2\#6\overline{\mathbb{C}P}^2$.

1. Introduction

The (generalized) rational blowdown technique, in which a linear plumbing of D^2-bundles over S^2 is excised from a smooth 4-manifold and replaced by a rational homology ball was introduced by Fintushel and Stern in [5] and generalized by Park in [13]. In [18], Symington showed that this procedure is symplectic. This technique has since been used to produce symplectic exotic rational surfaces. For example, in [14], Park produced an exotic $\mathbb{C}P^2\#7\overline{\mathbb{C}P}^2$ and in [16], Stipsicz and Szabó produced exotic $\mathbb{C}P^2\#6\overline{\mathbb{C}P}^2$s.

Determining which linear plumbings could be rationally blown down was a natural question. One way to produce such plumbings was by realizing them as complements of rational homology balls in certain blowups of $\overline{\mathbb{C}P}^2$ (see, for example, [13]). The following inductive procedure gave rise to these linear plumbings. The first is the -4-disk bundle over S^2 and the rest can be obtained by the following operation: If the linear plumbing with framings $(-b_1, ..., -b_k)$ can be rationally blown down, then the plumbings with framings $(-b_1-1, ..., -b_k, -2)$ and $(-2, -b_1, ..., -b_k-1)$ can also be rationally blown down. This operation will arise many times throughout the paper, so we give it a name.

Definition 1.1. Let $(-m_1, ..., -m_k)$ be a sequence of integers with $m_i \geq 2$ for all i. The *buddings* of $(-m_1, ..., -m_k)$ are the sequences $(-2, -m_1, ..., -m_{k-1}, -m_k-1)$ and $(-m_1-1, -m_2, ..., -m_k, -2)$.

In principle, since the boundary of a linear plumbing is a lens space, knowing which plumbings can be rationally blown down is the same as knowing which lens spaces bound rational homology balls. A family of such lens spaces was already found by Casson and Harer [2], who showed that $L(p, q)$ bounds a rational homology ball if $p = n^2$ and $q = nm - 1$, where n and m are positive coprime integers. Moreover, these lens spaces are precisely the boundaries of the plumbings given by the above inductive procedure. Furthermore, by taking symplectic structures into account, Lisca [8] showed that $(L(p, q), \xi_{st})$, where ξ_{st} is the standard contact structure on $L(p, q)$, has a rational homology ball weak symplectic filling if and only if $p = n^2$ and $q = nm - 1$, where n and m are coprime.

Since rational homology balls have Euler characteristic 1, a natural generalization is to determine which linear plumbings can be "symplectically replaced" by Euler characteristic k 4-manifolds. Finding such linear plumbings relies on the results of Lisca [8], which we quickly overview here. For all positive coprime integers p and q, by considering the Hirzebruch-Jung continued fraction expansion of $\frac{p}{p-q}$, Lisca completely classified all weak minimal symplectic fillings of $(L(p, q), \xi_{st})$ up to orientation preserving diffeomorphism. One of these fillings is the linear plumbing with Kirby

diagram obtained from the usual surgery diagram of $L(p,q)$. Thus, given a linear plumbing in which all framings are at most -2, one can determine its lens space boundary and then, through Lisca's characterization, determine all other weak minimal symplectic fillings of this lens space (with respect to the standard contact structure).

Definition 1.2. A (minimal) linear plumbing is called *k-replaceable* if its lens space boundary has an Euler characteristic k minimal strong symplectic filling with respect to the standard contact structure on the lens space. We call the Euler characteristic k filling the plumbing's *replacement*.

Remark 1.3. It is known, see [10], that every weak symplectic filling of a rational homology sphere can be modified into a strong symplectic filling. Thus, we may assume that the fillings described by Lisca are strong. This is desirable for symplectic cut and paste operations, which is the motivation for the term k-replaceable.

Remark 1.4. With this terminology, 1-replaceable linear plumbings are precisely the linear plumbings that can be rationally blown down (as defined in [13]).

In this paper, we are concerned with 2-replaceability. The first result is a classification of 2-replaceable linear plumbings. Note that there are infinitely many linear plumbings that have Euler characteristic 2, namely the disk bundles over S^2. We call such plumbings *trivially 2-replaceable*. Starting with one of these disk bundles we can easily construct infinitely many 2-replaceable linear plumbings by plumbing these disk bundles with 1-replaceable linear plumbings (since the latter can be rationally blown down, reducing the Euler characteristic to 2). If a 2-replaceable linear plumbing is of this form, we say that it is *degenerate*. These are the plumbings shown in Theorem 1.5(a). Since these are easy to construct, we are more interested in families of 2-replaceable linear plumbings that are *nondegenerate* such as those in Theorem 1.5(b) $-$ (d).

Theorem 1.5. *Let $(-b_1,...,-b_k)$ and $(-c_1,...,-c_l)$ be obtained by sequences of buddings of -4 and let $z \geq 2$ be any integer. Then a minimal linear plumbing is 2-replaceable if and only if it is either degenerate and thus of the form:*

(a) 

for $k,l \geq 0$

or can be obtained by a sequence of buddings of one of the linear plumbings of the form:

(b) 

for $k \geq 0$.

(c) 

(d) 

for $k,l \geq 1$

Remark 1.6. In principle, this theorem answers the question "Which lens spaces (equipped with the standard contact structure) have symplectic fillings of Euler characteristic 2?" However, the author has not worked out a useful formula for the possible p and q values for these lens spaces.

The concept of 2-replaceability can be extended to plumbing trees. In [6], it is shown that any negative definite minimal plumbing tree is a minimal strong symplectic filling of its boundary manifold with respect to some contact structure. We call a (negative definite) plumbing tree *k-replaceable* if its boundary has a minimal strong symplectic filling of Euler characteristic k with respect to the same contact structure. For example, families of 1-replaceable trees can be found in [17]. In Section 2, without reliance on Theorem 1.5, we will prove the following:

Theorem 1.7. *For any integers $n, m \geq 3$, the following are families of 2-replaceable trees:*



Remark 1.8. These families will be constructed from the length 4 (2-replaceable) linear plumbing with framings $-2, -4, -4$, and -2. It turns out that these are interesting in the sense that they cannot all be built trivially by plumbing the 1-replaceable trees of [17] to a disk bundle over S^2 (c.f. the plumbings in Theorem 1.5a).

Remark 1.9. The technique used in the proof of Theorem 1.7 can be applied to obtain more families of 2-replaceable trees. For example, instead of starting with the linear plumbing corresponding to $[2, 4, 4, 2]$, one could start with other 2-replaceable linear plumbings. We focus on the two families in Theorem 1.7 mainly because they have been successfully used to produce exotic manifolds, one of which will be constructed in Section 3 and is the content of the next theorem.

Theorem 1.10. *The 2-replaceable tree of Theorem 1.7(a) with $n = 9$ and $m = 3$ can be embedded in $\mathbb{C}P^2\#16\overline{\mathbb{C}P}^2$. Call this tree C and let B denote its Euler characteristic 2 replacement. Then $X = (\mathbb{C}P^2\#16\overline{\mathbb{C}P}^2 \setminus \text{int}(C)) \cup_{\partial C} B$ is homeomorphic but not diffeomorphic to $\mathbb{C}P^2\#6\overline{\mathbb{C}P}^2$. Furthermore, X admits a symplectic structure.*

This paper is structured as follows. In Section 2, we construct the 2-replaceable plumbing trees of Theorem 1.7 and in Section 3 we use symplectic cut and paste to construct the exotic $\mathbb{C}P^2\#6\overline{\mathbb{C}P}^2$ of Theorem 1.10. In Section 4, we prove some facts about Hirzenbruch-Jung continued fractions that are needed for the proof of Theorem 1.5, which can be found in Section 5.

Acknowledgements. I am very grateful to my advisor Thomas E. Mark for providing me with the initial question that led to this work and for his help, support, and patience along the way.

2. 2-Replaceable Trees – Proof of Theorem 1.7

We first highlight the general strategy used to prove Theorem 1.7. Let C be a 2-replaceable linear plumbing with Euler characteristic 2 replacement B. Then, by definition, C and B are both minimal symplectic fillings of some lens space $(L(p, q), \xi_{st})$. C is known to admit a Lefschetz fibration over D^2 with monodromy that can be written down explicitly (see, for example, [6]). In [1], it is shown that B admits a positive allowable Lefschetz fibration (PALF) with monodromy that can also be explicitly written down. Furthermore, one can explicitly show that the monodromies of C and B are related by a sequence of monodromy substitutions. Thus they are factorizations of the same monodromy. Applying a lemma due to Endo, Mark, and Van Horn-Morris in [3] (which we recall below) to the monodromy factorizations of C and B, we will obtain two new equivalent monodromy factorizations, which will describe two new Lefschetz fibrations. Call the total spaces of these fibrations C' and B', respectively. Now, $Y = \partial C' = \partial B'$ has an open book that can be described by these two factorizations. By the correspondence between contact structures and open book decompositions, $Y = \partial C' = \partial B'$ admits a contact structure, ξ, that is supported by

both open books. As we will see, C' is a plumbing and B' is an Euler characteristic 2 PALF. Furthermore, it is known that C' and B' are both (strong) symplectic fillings of (Y, ξ) (see [6] and [15], respectively). To see that B' is minimal, it suffices to note that B' is not among the trees in [17] that can be blown down symplectically. Thus C' is a 2-replaceable (possibly nonlinear) plumbing. This argument shows that through repeated use of Endo, Mark, and Van Horn-Morris' *Key Lemma*, we can build families of 2-replaceable trees. In this way, we will produce the 2-replaceable trees of Theorem 1.7. For convenience, we recall the Key Lemma here.

Lemma 2.1. *(Key Lemma [3]) Let F be a planar surface containing as a subsurface a pair of pants, S_3. Let z and d be the boundary parallel curves marked in Figure 1 and let the boundary component of S_3 corresponding to z coincide with a component of ∂F. Let F' be the planar surface obtained from F by gluing a disk with two holes into the hole enclosed by z. Suppose that in the planar mapping class group $Mod(F, \partial F)$, the relation $w_1 z w_2 = w_1' d w_2'$ holds for some $w_1, w_2, w_1', w_2' \in Mod(F, \partial F)$. If a commutes with either w_1 and w_1' or w_2 and w_2', then in $Mod(F', \partial F')$ we have the relation $w_1 a b c w_2 = w_1' x y w_2'$.*



FIGURE 1. The Key Lemma

All monodromy factorizations will be products of right-handed Dehn twists around simple closed curves. For simplicity, a curve and a right-handed Dehn twist about the curve will have the same label.

We start with the length 4 linear plumbing with framings $-2, -4, -4$, and -2, associated to the fraction $[2, 4, 4, 2] = \frac{45}{26}$. It has boundary $L(45, 26)$. Viewed as a Lefschetz fibration, its monodromy factorization is drawn on the left side of Figure 2 (see [6] for details). It is given by $x_0^2 x_1 x_2 x_3 y x_4 x_5^2$. Using a lantern relation applied to $x_3 y x_4 x_5$, we obtain the middle factorization in Figure 2, $x_0^2 x_1 x_2 z e f x_5 = x_0^2 x_1 x_2 z x_5 e f$. Finally, using the more general daisy relation (defined in [3]), applied to $x_0^2 x_1 x_2 z x_5$, we obtain the final factorization, $abcdef$, pictured on the right side of Figure 2. Thus, we have the relation $x_0^2 x_1 x_2 x_3 x_4 x_5^2 y = abcdef$. By drawing a handlebody diagram (see, for example, [3]) of the total space of the Lefschetz fibration described by the rightmost monodromy factorization, it is easy to see that this 4-manifold has Euler characteristic 2, proving that the linear plumbing associated to $[2, 4, 4, 2]$ is indeed 2-replaceable.



FIGURE 2. $x_0^2 x_1 x_2 x_3 x_4 x_5^2 y = x_0^2 x_1 x_2 z x_5 e f = abcdef$



(A) $x_0^2x_1x_2x_3x_4x_5^2y = abcdef$ implies $x_0x_1x_2x_3x_4x_5x_6^2wyz = abc_1c_2def$



(B) $x_0\cdots x_{n+2}^2wyz^{n-3} = abc_1\cdots c_{n-2}def$ implies $x_0\cdots x_{n+3}^2wyz^{n-2} = abc_1\cdots c_{n-1}def$



(C) $x_0\cdots x_{n+3}^2wyz^{n-2} = abc_1\cdots c_{n-1}def$ implies $x_0\cdots x_{n+3}x_{n+4}^3wyz^{n-2} = abc_1\cdots c_{n-1}de_2e_1f$



(D) $x_0\cdots x_{n+m-2}x_{n+m-1}^{m-2}wyz^{n-2} = abc_1\cdots c_{n-1}de_{m-2}\cdots e_1f$ implies
$x_0\cdots x_{n+m-1}x_{n+m}^{m-1}wyz^{n-2} = abc_1\cdots c_{n-1}de_{m-1}\cdots e_1f$

FIGURE 3. Repeated applications of the Key Lemma to the bold circles

Now we will repeatedly apply the Key Lemma to the relation $x_0^2x_1x_2x_3x_4x_5^2y = abcdef$ to build a family of 2-replaceable trees. Starting with this relation, we apply the Key Lemma to x_0 and c, shown in bold in Figure 3a. Notice that z (shown on the right side of Figure 3a) commutes with ab, so that the Key Lemma applies. Thus the hole encircled by x_0 splits and we obtain the relation $zx_1x_0wx_2x_3x_4x_5x_6^2y = abc_1c_2def$, or $x_0x_1x_2x_3x_4x_5x_6^2wyz = abc_1c_2def$, depicted on the right side of Figure 3a. Notice that in the new relation, we relabelled the boundary parallel curves for convenience and one of the curves that was labelled x_0 is now labelled w. This relabelling will be done throughout. The 4-manifold which has Lefschetz fibration described by the monodromy abc_1c_2def has Euler characteristic 2. Thus the plumbing tree associated to the monodromy $x_0x_1x_2x_3x_4x_5x_6^2wyz$ is 2-replaceable (see Figure 4a). Now, inductively assume that the relation $x_0\cdots x_{n+3}^2wyz^{n-3} = abc_1\cdots c_{n-1}def$ holds, as in the left side of Figure 3b. Then, again since z commutes with ab, we can apply the Key Lemma to x_0 and c_1 to obtain the relation $x_0\cdots x_{n+3}^2wyz^{n-2} = abc_1\cdots c_{n-1}def$. As before, the Euler characteristic of the 4-manifold with

Leftschetz fibration described by the monodromy $abc_1 \cdots c_{n-1}def$ has Euler characteristic 2 and so the plumbing tree shown in Figure 4b is 2-replaceable for all $n \geq 2$.



(A) Plumbing associated to Figure 3a



(B) Plumbing associated to Figure 3b



(C) Plumbing associated to Figure 3c



(D) Plumbing associated to Figure 3d

FIGURE 4. 2-replaceable plumbings associated to the monodromies in Figure 3

Next, we want to apply the Key Lemma to x_{n+2} and e. To do this, we view the $n+3$ punctured disk as an $n+4$ punctured sphere. Thus the outermost boundary of the disk is just another puncture and so we can view x_{n+3} as a curve around a puncture and e as a curve around the two punctures with boundary parallel curves x_{n+2} and x_{n+3}. These are shown in bold on the left side of Figure 3c. Since x_{n+4} (as labelled on the right side of Figure 3c) commutes with everything, the Key Lemma applies, yielding the relation $x_0 \cdots x_{n+1}x_{n+4}x_{n+2}x_{n+3}x_{n+4}^2wyz^{n-2} = abc_1 \cdots c_{n-1}de_2e_1f$, or $x_0 \cdots x_{n+3}x_{n+4}^3wyz^{n-2} = abc_1 \cdots c_{n-1}de_2e_1f$. This relation proves that the linear plumbing depicted in Figure 4c is 2-replaceable. Now, inductively assume that the relation $x_0 \cdots x_{n+m-2}x_{n+m-1}^{m-2}wyz^{n-2} = abc_1 \cdots c_{n-1}de_{m-2} \cdots e_1f$ holds, as in the left side of Figure 3d. Notice that each curve e_i encircles all the punctures except the one labelled i for $1 \leq i \leq m-2$, as depicted in Figure 3d. Also note that, with this labelling, we can write $f = e_0$. We now apply the Key Lemma as we did previously to the bold curves labelled x_{n+m-2} and e_{m-2} to obtain the relation $x_0 \cdots x_{n+m-1}x_{n+m}^{m-1}wyz^{n-2} = abc_1 \cdots c_{n-1}de_{m-1} \cdots e_1f$. This relation proves that the plumbing tree depicted in Figure 4d is 2-replaceable for all $m \geq 3$. Thus we have proved that the family of trees in Theorem 1.7a are indeed 2-replaceable.

To obtain the family in Theorem 1.7b, we go back to the the relation $x_0^2x_1x_2x_3x_4x_5^2y = abcdef$, depicted in Figure 2. We will apply the Key Lemma to the bold circles x_0 and a shown in 5a. Since x_2, as labelled in the third monodromy in Figure 5a commutes with everything, the Key Lemma applies and we obtain the relation $wx_2x_0x_1x_2x_3x_4x_5x_6^2y = a_1a_2bcdef$, or $x_0x_1x_2^2x_3x_4x_5x_6^2wy = a_1a_2bcdef$, as shown in the figure. Thus, the plumbing tree shown in Figure 6a is 2-replaceable. Inductively assume that $x_0 \cdots x_{m-3}x_{m-2}^{m-2}x_{m-1}x_mx_{m+1}x_{m+2}^2wy = a_1 \cdots a_{m-2}bcdef$, as in Figure 5b. Again, since x_{m-1}, as labelled in the third monodromy in Figure 5b, commutes with everything, we can apply the Key Lemma to obtain the relation $x_0 \cdots x_{m-2}x_{m-1}^{m-1}x_mx_{m+1}x_{m+2}x_{m+3}^2wy = a_1 \cdots a_{m-1}bcdef$. Thus, the plumbing tree in Figure 6b is 2-replaceable.



(A) $x_0^2x_1x_2x_3x_4x_5^2y = abcdef$ implies $x_0x_1x_2^2x_3x_4x_5x_6^2wy = a_1a_2bcdef$



(B) $x_0 \cdots x_{m-3}x_{m-2}^{m-2}x_{m-1}x_mx_{m+1}x_{m+2}^2wy = a_1 \cdots a_{m-2}bcdef$ implies
$x_0 \cdots x_{m-2}x_{m-1}^{m-1}x_mx_{m+1}x_{m+2}x_{m+3}^2wy = a_1 \cdots a_{m-1}bcdef$



(C) $x_0 \cdots x_{m-2}x_{m-1}^{m-1}x_mx_{m+1}x_{m+2}x_{m+3}^2wy = a_1 \cdots a_{m-1}bcdef$ implies
$x_0 \cdots x_{m-2}x_{m-1}^{m-1}x_mx_{m+1}x_{m+2}^2x_{m+3}x_{m+4}wyz = a_1 \cdots a_{m-1}bcde_1e_2f$


x_{m+3} x_{m+2} x_{m+1} $m-2$ x_0 x_{m-2} w $m-1$ x_{m+1} x_{m+n+1} y z x_{m-1} x_m f c e_{n-3} a_{m-1} a_1 b d e_1 e_{n-2} x_{m+3} x_{m+2} x_{m+1} $m-2$ x_0 x_{m-2} w $m-1$ x_{m+1} x_{m+n+2} y z x_{m-1} x_m f c e_{n-2} a_{m-1} a_1 b d e_1 e_{n-1}

(D) $x_0 \cdots x_{m-2}x_{m-1}^{m-1}x_mx_{m+1}x_{m+2}^{n-2}x_{m+3}x_{m+4}wyz = a_1 \cdots a_{m-1}bcde_1e_2f$ implies
$x_0 \cdots x_{m-2}x_{m-1}^{m-1}x_mx_{m+1}x_{m+2}^{n-1}x_{m+3} \cdots x_{m+n+2}wyz = a_1 \cdots a_{m-1}bcde_1 \cdots e_{n-1}f$

FIGURE 5. Repeated applications of the Key Lemma to the bold circles

Now view the leftmost punctured disk in Figure 2 as a sphere with six punctures. Then we can arrange the sphere so that the curve labelled y is the equator and the northern and southern hemispheres both have 3 punctures, two of which have one parallel curve and one of which has two parallel curves. In the previous paragraph, we repeatedly applied the Key Lemma to curves in only one of the hemispheres (without involving the equator y). Thus we can also apply it to the other hemisphere in the exact same way. We now do this explicitly. In the relation $x_0 \cdots x_{m-2}x_{m-1}^{m-1}x_mx_{m+1}x_{m+2}x_{m+3}^2wy = a_1 \cdots a_{m-1}bcdef$, consider the bold curves x_{m+3} and a_{m-1} in Figure 5b . We view the latter as a curve containing the two punctures with boundary parallel curves x_{m+2} and x_{m+3}. Since x_{m+2} commutes with everything, we can apply the Key Lemma to obtain $x_0 \cdots x_{m-2}x_{m-1}^{m-1}x_mx_{m+1}x_{m+2}x_{m+2}x_{m+3}x_{m+4}zwy = a_1 \cdots a_{m-1}bcde_1e_2f$, or $x_0 \cdots$



(A) Plumbing associated to Figure 5a



(B) Plumbing associated to Figure 5b



(C) Plumbing associated to Figure 5c



(D) Plumbing associated to Figure 5d

FIGURE 6. 2-replaceable plumbings associated to the monodromies in Figure 5

$x_{m-2}x_{m-1}^{m-1}x_m x_{m+1}x_{m+2}^2 x_{m+3}x_{m+4}zwy = a_1\cdots a_{m-1}bcde_1e_2f$. Thus the plumbing tree in Figure 6c is 2-replaceable. Inductively assume the relation $x_0\cdots x_{m-2}x_{m-1}^{m-1}x_m x_{m+1}x_{m+2}^{n-2}x_{m+3}\cdots x_{m+n+1}zwy = a_1\cdots a_{m-1}bcde_1\cdots e_{n-2}f$, as in Figure 5d, holds. Again, since x_{m+2} commutes with everything, we can apply the Key Lemma to obtain the relation $x_0\cdots x_{m-2}x_{m-1}^{m-1}x_m x_{m+1}x_{m+2}^{n-1}x_{m+3}\cdots x_{m+n+2}zwy = a_1\cdots a_{m-1}bcde_1\cdots e_1\cdots e_{n-1}f$. Thus the plumbing tree in Figure 6d is 2-replaceable and thus the family of trees in Theorem 1.7b are indeed 2-replaceable. This concludes the proof of Theorem 1.7.

3. An Exotic $\mathbb{C}P^2\#6\overline{\mathbb{C}P}^2$ – Proof of Theorem 1.10

In this section we will find a 2-replaceable plumbing in $\mathbb{C}P^2\#16\overline{\mathbb{C}P}^2$, excise it, and replace it with its Euler characteristic 2 replacement in order to construct an exotic $\mathbb{C}P^2\#6\overline{\mathbb{C}P}^2$. Since this operation is symplectic (see [6]), the resulting manifold will be symplectic.

In [16], Stipsicz and Szabó showed that there exists an elliptic fibration $\mathbb{C}P^2\#9\overline{\mathbb{C}P}^2 \to \mathbb{C}P^1$ with three fishtail fibers, two sections, and a singular fiber of type III* (i.e. an $\tilde{E}_7$ singular fiber) which intersect as in Figure 7a. Starting with this configuration, blow up the three double points in the fishtail fibers, blow up the points P_2 and P_5, blow up the point P_1 twice, and smooth the points P_3 and P_4. The resulting configuration is shown in Figure 7b. Since we blew up $\mathbb{C}P^2\#9\overline{\mathbb{C}P}^2$ seven times, this configuration lives in $\mathbb{C}P^2\#16\overline{\mathbb{C}P}^2$. Furthermore, notice that the the plumbing depicted in Figure 8 is embedded in this configuration. By Theorem 1.7a, this plumbing is 2-replaceable.

Let C denote the 2-replaceable plumbing tree in Figure 8 and let B denote its Euler characteristic 2 replacement. Let $X = (\mathbb{C}P^2\#16\overline{\mathbb{C}P}^2 \backslash \mathrm{int}(C)) \cup_{\partial C} B$.

Proposition 3.1. *X is homeomorphic to $\mathbb{C}P^2\#6\overline{\mathbb{C}P}^2$.*

Proof. We first prove that X is simply connected. Since $\mathbb{C}P^2\#16\overline{\mathbb{C}P}^2$ is simply connected, the inclusion $\partial C \hookrightarrow \mathbb{C}P^2\#16\overline{\mathbb{C}P}^2 \setminus \mathrm{int}(C)$ induces a surjection $\pi_1(\partial C) \to \pi_1(\mathbb{C}P^2\#16\overline{\mathbb{C}P}^2 \setminus \mathrm{int}(C))$. Furthermore, since B is built out of 0,1, and 2 handles, the inclusion $\partial B = \partial C \hookrightarrow B$ also induces a surjection $\pi_1(\partial C) \to \pi_1(B)$. By the Seifert Van-Kampen theorem, we have $\pi_1(X) = \pi_1(\mathbb{C}P^2\#16\overline{\mathbb{C}P}^2 \setminus \mathrm{int}(C)) *_{\pi_1(\partial C)} \pi_1(B)$. Thus, in the amalgamation, the generators of $\pi_1(\mathbb{C}P^2\#16\overline{\mathbb{C}P}^2 \setminus \mathrm{int}(C))$ can be expressed in terms of the generators of $\pi_1(B)$. Therefore, if the generators of $\pi_1(B)$ bound disks in X, then $\pi_1(X)$ is trivial. We will first prove that $\pi_1(B)$ is cyclic of order 17 and then show that a single nonzero element of $\pi_1(B)$ bounds a disk in X.



(A) A configuration in $E(1)$ (B) Configuration after seven blowups

FIGURE 7. Blowing up $E(1)$ seven times



FIGURE 8. The configuration C

In the proof of Theorem 1.7a, we explicitly described the monodromy of B when viewed as a Lefschetz fibration (see Figure 3b). Figure 10a (ignoring the red curve labelled γ) is a handlebody diagram of B obtained from this monodromy. Each blue unknot has framing -1 and, from bottom to top, these unknots correspond to the curves $a, b, c_1, ..., c_8, d, e, f$ in the monodromy factorization shown in Figure 3b. Let m_i be a meridian around the i^{th} 1-handle of the diagram (Figure 10a), counting left to right. Then $\pi_1(B)$ is generated by these meridians and is subject to the relations $m_i m_{11} m_{12} = 1$ for $i = 1, ..., 8$, $m_9 \cdots m_{12} = 1$, $m_1 \cdots m_9 = 1$, $m_1 \cdots m_{11}$=1, $m_1 \cdots m_8 m_{10} = 1$, and $m_1 \cdots m_{10} m_{12} = 1$, which are given by the 2-handles. Combining these, we have $m_1 = \cdots = m_8$. Call this element m. Furthermore, we have $m_9 = m_{10} = m^{-8}$ and $m_{11} = m_{12} = m^8$. Thus, $1 = m_1 m_{11} m_{12} = m^{17}$ and so $\pi_1(B) \cong \mathbb{Z}_{17}$.



FIGURE 9. A meridian of C

Figure 9 depicts a handlebody diagram for C. Consider the red meridian labelled γ in C. In the original configuration of spheres found in $\mathbb{C}P^2 \# 16\overline{\mathbb{C}P}^2$, γ can be identified with the equator



(A) A Kirby diagram for B (B) A surgery description for ∂B (C) Blow down the blue unknots in (B) (D) Result after isotoping the red, green, and blue strands

(E) Isotope the blue and green strands (F) Rearrangement of the twists (G) Perform blowups (H) A Kirby diagram for C

FIGURE 10. Using Kirby calculus to show B and C have the same boundary, while keeping track of the meridian γ

of the -2 sphere colored in blue that is "dangling off" the singular fiber of type III*. Thus this meridan bounds a disk (a hemisphere of the blue -2 sphere) in $\mathbb{C}P^2\#16\overline{\mathbb{C}P}^2 \setminus C$ and thus bounds a disk in X. So, if we show that the image of γ is nonzero in $\pi_1(B)$, then we are done. Viewed as a Lefschetz fibration, the handlebody diagram for C obtained from its monodromy (Figure 3b) is shown in Figure 10h. The blue unknots have framing -1. The equivalence between Figures 10h and 9 can be shown explicitly using the following handle slides and cancellations:

1. Slide a over b, followed by b over c, and followed by c over d.
2. Slide d over each of the 8 blue unknots at the top of the 1-handles labelled 1-8.

3. Slide c over the 9th and 10th blue unknots at the top of the 1-handles labelled 9 and 10.
4. Slide b over e, e over f, f over g, g over h, h over i, i over j, and j over k.
5. Slide k over the 11th and 12th blue unknots at the top of the 1-handles labelled 11 and 12.
6. Cancel the 1-2 handle pairs to obtain C, as in Figure 9.

Reversing this process shows that the meridian γ links the blue unknots g and h once in Figure 10h. By changing the dotted circles to 0-framing unknots, we can see γ in a surgery diagram for ∂C, as in Figure 10g. Now, by blowing down g and h, γ links the 11th and 12th 1-handles twice. Isotope γ down to the bottom of the diagram and further blow down all of the other blue unknots to obtain figure $10f$. We claim that γ is also visible in the handlebody diagram for B and links the 11th and 12th 1-handles twice, as depicted in Figure 10a. Starting with this diagram for B, change the dotted circles to 0-framed unknots to obtain a surgery diagram for ∂B (Figure 10b). Next, blow down all of the blue -1 framed unknots to obtain Figure 10c. Now, we may isotope the vertical red strand under the strand immediately to its left and pull it leftward. Then pull the blue and green strands leftward to obtain Figure 10d. Next, introduce a positive twist at the top of the blue and green strands and a negative twist at the bottom of the same strands (these twists counteract each other) to obtain Figure 10e. Finally, we can rearrange the strands to appear as in Figure 10f. Notice that none of these moves affect the position of γ. Thus, in $\pi_1(B)$, $\gamma = m_{11}m_{12}m_{11}m_{12} = m^{15}$, which is a generator of $\pi_1(B)$. Thus, X is simply connected.

Next, notice that $\chi(X) = \chi(\mathbb{C}P^2\#16\overline{\mathbb{C}P}^2) - \chi(C) + \chi(B) = 19 - 12 + 2 = 9 = \chi(\mathbb{C}P^2\#6\overline{\mathbb{C}P}^2)$. Now, since $\chi(B) = 2$ and $\text{rank}(H_1(B;\mathbb{Z})) = \text{rank}(H_3(B;\mathbb{Z})) = \text{rank}(H_4(B;\mathbb{Z})) = 0$, we must have $\text{rank}(H_2(B;\mathbb{Z})) = 1$. In [4], Etnyre showed that any symplectic filling of a contact manifold supported by a planar open book is negative definite. Thus the signature of B is $-\text{rank}(H_2(B;\mathbb{Z})) = -1$ and so $\sigma(X) = \sigma(\mathbb{C}P^2\#16\overline{\mathbb{C}P}^2) - \sigma(C) + \sigma(B) = -15 - (-11) + (-1) = -5 = \sigma(\mathbb{C}P^2\#6\overline{\mathbb{C}P}^2)$. Finally, since -5 is not divisible by 16, the intersection forms of X and $\mathbb{C}P^2\#6\overline{\mathbb{C}P}^2$ are both odd. Thus, by Freedman's theorem, X is homeomorphic to $\mathbb{C}P^2\#6\overline{\mathbb{C}P}^2$. □

Proposition 3.2. *X is not diffeomorphic to $\mathbb{C}P^2\#6\overline{\mathbb{C}P}^2$.*

Proof. Let h denote the canonical generator of $H_2(\mathbb{C}P^2;\mathbb{Z})$ in $H_2(\mathbb{C}P^2\#16\overline{\mathbb{C}P}^2;\mathbb{Z}) = H_2(\mathbb{C}P^2;\mathbb{Z}) \bigoplus 16H_2(\overline{\mathbb{C}P}^2;\mathbb{Z})$ and let e_i, for $1 \leq i \leq 16$, denote the homology class of the i^{th} exceptional sphere of the i^{th} blowup, which generates the i^{th} copy of $H_2(\overline{\mathbb{C}P}^2;\mathbb{Z})$. Then in Figure 7a, the bottom horizontal section has homology class e_1, the top horizontal section has homology class e_9, each fishtail fiber has homology $3h - \sum_{i=1}^{9} e_i$, the vertical chain of -2 spheres have homology classes (working bottom to top) $h - e_1 - e_2 - e_3, e_3 - e_4, e_4 - e_5, e_5 - e_6, e_6 - e_7, e_7 - e_8, e_8 - e_9$, and the blue -2 sphere has homology class $h - e_3 - e_4 - e_5$ (see [16]). After performing the seven blowups described earlier, the spheres in our configuration C, labelled as in Figure 8 and found in Figure 7b, have the following homology classes:

$u_1 = 6h - e_1 - \sum_{i=2}^{9} 2e_i - 2e_{11} - 2e_{12} - \sum_{i=13}^{16} e_i$, $u_2 = 3h - \sum_{i=1}^{9} e_i - 2e_{10}$, $u_3 = e_9 - e_{14} - e_{15} - e_{16}$, $u_4 = e_{15} - e_{16}$, $u_5 = e_8 - e_9$, $u_6 = e_7 - e_8$, $u_7 = e_6 - e_7$, $u_8 = e_5 - e_6$, $u_9 = e_4 - e_5$, $u_{10} = e_3 - e_4$, $u_{11} = h - e_1 - e_2 - e_3 - e_{13}$.

We now use an argument similar to that in [16]. For details about Seiberg-Witten invariants when $b^+ = 1$, see [16]. It is known that $SW^{\circ}_{\mathbb{C}P^2\#6\overline{\mathbb{C}P}^2} \equiv 0$ because $\mathbb{C}P^2\#6\overline{\mathbb{C}P}^2$ admits a metric of positive scalar curvature. Thus, we must find $\tilde{K} \in H^2(X;\mathbb{Z})$ such that $SW^{\circ}_X(\tilde{K}) \neq 0$. Let $K = PD(3h - \sum_{i=1}^{16} e_i)$. Then $K|_{\mathbb{C}P^2\#16\overline{\mathbb{C}P}^2 \setminus \text{int}(C)}$ extends to a characteristic class $\tilde{K} \in H^2(X;\mathbb{Z})$.

This can be seen by noting that $PD(K|_{\partial C}) = 782\mu \in H_1(\partial C;\mathbb{Z}) = \mathbb{Z}_{1445}$, where μ is the generator for $H_1(\partial C;\mathbb{Z})$ given by the meridian of the rightmost unknot in the surgery description of ∂C shown in Figure 9. Since $H_1(B;\mathbb{Z}) = \mathbb{Z}_{17}$ and 782 is a multiple of 17, $PD(K|_{\partial C})$ extends trivially. Now, by [7], ∂C is an L-space and so by Michalogiorgaki [9], $SW^{\circ}_{X,PD(\alpha)}(\tilde{K}) = SW^{\circ}_{\mathbb{C}P^2\#16\overline{\mathbb{C}P}^2,PD(\alpha)}(K)$ in a chosen chamber, where α is some element of $H_2(16\overline{\mathbb{C}P}^2;\mathbb{Z})$ with $\alpha\cdot\alpha > 0$ represented in $\mathbb{C}P^2\#16\overline{\mathbb{C}P}^2 \setminus \text{int}(C)$.

Let $\alpha = 10h-3e_1-2e_2-\sum_{i=3}^{9} 3e_i-2e_{10}-e_{11}-2e_{12}-2e_{13}-3e_{14}$. Notice that $\alpha\cdot\alpha = 2 > 0$ and $\alpha\cdot u_i = 0$ for all $1 \leq i \leq 11$. Thus it is represented in $\mathbb{C}P^2\#16\overline{\mathbb{C}P}^2 \setminus \text{int}(C)$. Now, $SW^{\circ}_{\mathbb{C}P^2\#16\overline{\mathbb{C}P}^2,PD(h)} = 0$, since this chamber contains the period point of positive scalar curvature. Thus, since $K(h) = 3 > 0$, we have $SW^{\circ}_{\mathbb{C}P^2\#16\overline{\mathbb{C}P}^2,PD(h)}(K) = SW^{+}_{\mathbb{C}P^2\#16\overline{\mathbb{C}P}^2,PD(h)}(K) = 0$. Next, notice $K(\alpha) = -6 < 0$ and $h\cdot\alpha = 10 > 0$ (and so $K\cdot PD(\alpha) < 0, PD(h)\cdot PD(\alpha) > 0$, and $PD(h)\cdot PD(h) > 0$). Thus, by the wall crossing formula, we have $SW^{\circ}_{\mathbb{C}P^2\#16\overline{\mathbb{C}P}^2,PD(h)}(K) - SW^{\circ}_{\mathbb{C}P^2\#16\overline{\mathbb{C}P}^2,PD(\alpha)}(K) = (-1)^{1+d(k)/2}$ and so $SW^{\circ}_{X,PD(\alpha)}(\tilde{K}) = SW^{\circ}_{\mathbb{C}P^2\#16\overline{\mathbb{C}P}^2,PD(\alpha)}(K) \neq 0$. □

4. Continued Fractions

In this section we outline and prove useful facts about Hirzenbruch-Jung continued fractions that will be needed for the proof of Theorem 1.5. For readability, the reader may choose to move on to Section 5 and refer back to this section for any relevant lemmas. Given a sequence of integers, $(a_1, ..., a_n)$, the (Hirzenbruch-Jung) continued fraction is:

$$[a_1, ..., a_n] = a_1 - \cfrac{1}{a_2 - \cfrac{1}{\cdots - \cfrac{1}{a_n}}}$$

If $a_i \geq 2$ for all $1 \leq i \leq n$, then this fraction is well-defined and the numerator is greater than the denominator. In fact, for coprime $p > q > 0 \in \mathbb{Z}$, there exists a unique continued fraction expansion $[a_1, ..., a_n] = \frac{p}{q}$, where $a_i \geq 2$ for all $1 \leq i \leq n$.

We call the continued fraction expansions $\frac{p}{q} = [a_1, a_2, ..., a_n]$ and $\frac{p}{p-q} = [m_1, m_2, ..., m_k]$ *dual* to each other, where $a_i, m_j \geq 2\ \forall\ 1 \leq i \leq n,\ 1 \leq j \leq k$.

Before we move on to the lemmas, we recall two known basic facts (see for example [11]):

- $[a_1, ..., a_n] = 0$ if and only if $[a_n, ..., a_1] = 0$ (after relaxing the condition $a_j \geq 2\ \forall\ 1 \leq j \leq n$)
- if $\frac{p}{q} = [a_1, ..., a_n]$, then $[a_n, ..., a_1] = \frac{p}{\overline{q}}$, where $\overline{q}$ is the unique integer such that $1 < \overline{q} < p$ and $q\overline{q} \equiv 1 \text{ mod} p$.

4.1. Basic General Properties.

For the following lemmas, assume $a_i, m_j \geq 2$ for all $1 \leq i \leq n, 1 \leq j \leq k$.

Lemma 4.1. *Let $[a_1, ..., a_n]$ have dual $[m_1, ..., m_k]$. Then $[a_n, ..., a_1]$ has dual $[m_k, ..., m_1]$.*

Proof. Let $[a_1, ..., a_n] = \dfrac{p}{q}$ have dual $[m_1, ..., m_k] = \dfrac{p}{p-q}$. Then $[a_n, ..., a_1] = \dfrac{p}{\overline{q}}$, where $0 < \overline{q} < p$ and $q\overline{q} \equiv 1 \text{ mod} p$. Now, $[m_k, ..., m_1] = \dfrac{p}{x}$, where $0 < x < p$ and $(p-q)x \equiv 1 \text{ mod} p$. Since $0 < p - \overline{q} < p$ and $(p-q)(p-\overline{q}) = p(p-\overline{q}) - pq + q\overline{q} \equiv q\overline{q} \text{ mod} p \equiv 1 \text{ mod} p$, we have that $p - \overline{q} = x$. □

Lemma 4.2. *Let $[a_1, ..., a_n]$ and $[m_1, ..., m_k]$ be dual fractions with $n \geq 2$. Then $a_1 = 2$ if and only if $m_1 \neq 2$. Thus, by Lemma 4.1, $a_n = 2$ if and only if $m_k \neq 2$.*

Proof. Let $\frac{p}{q} = [a_1, a_2, ..., a_n]$ and $\frac{p}{p-q} = [m_1, m_2, ..., m_k]$. Let $a_1 = 2$ and assume $m_1 = 2$. Then $\frac{p}{p-q} = 2 - \frac{p-2q}{p-q}$ with $p - 2q > 0$ and so $p > 2q$. But, $\frac{p}{q} = [2, a_2, ..., a_n] = 2 - \frac{1}{[a_2, ..., a_n]}$ and so $p = 2q - \frac{q}{[a_2, ..., a_n]} < 2q$, a contradiction. Thus $m_1 \neq 2$. By the same argument, the converse is also true. □

Lemma 4.3. *If $[a_1, a_2, ..., a_n]$ has dual $[m_1, m_2, ..., m_k]$, then $[1+a_1, a_2, ..., a_n]$ has dual $[2, m_1, m_2, ..., m_k]$. Conversely, if $[1+a_1, a_2, ..., a_n]$ has dual $[2, m_1, m_2, ..., m_k]$, then $[a_1, a_2, ..., a_n]$ has dual $[m_1, m_2, ..., m_k]$. Thus, by Lemma 4.1, if $[a_1, a_2, ..., a_n]$ has dual $[m_1, m_2, ..., m_k]$, then $[a_1, a_2, ..., a_n + 1]$ has dual $[m_1, m_2, ..., m_k, 2]$ and, conversely, if $[a_1, a_2, ..., a_n+1]$ has dual $[m_1, m_2, ..., m_k, 2]$, then $[a_1, a_2, ..., a_n]$ has dual $[m_1, m_2, ..., m_k]$*

Proof. Let $\frac{p}{q} = [a_1, a_2, ..., a_n]$ and $\frac{p}{p-q} = [m_1, m_2, ..., m_k]$. Then $[1 + a_1, a_2, ..., a_n] = 1 + [a_1, a_2, ..., a_n] = 1 + \frac{p}{q} = \frac{p+q}{q}$ has dual $\frac{p+q}{p} = 2 - \frac{p-q}{p} = 2 - \frac{1}{\frac{p}{p-q}} = 2 - \frac{1}{[m_1, m_2, ..., m_k]} = [2, m_1, m_2, ..., m_k]$. Conversely, let $\frac{p}{q} = [1 + a_1, a_2, ..., a_n]$ and $\frac{p}{p-q} = [2, m_1, m_2, ..., m_k]$. Then $[a_1, a_2, ..., a_n] = -1 + [1 + a_1, a_2, ..., a_n] = -1 + \frac{p}{q} = \frac{p-q}{q}$ has dual $\frac{p-q}{p-2q}$. On the other hand, we have $\frac{p}{p-q} = 2 - \frac{1}{[m_1, m_2, ..., m_k]}$ and so $[m_1, m_2, ..., m_k] = \frac{p-q}{p-2q}$. Thus $[a_1, a_2, ..., a_n]$ and $[m_1, m_2, ..., m_k]$ are dual to each other. □

Lemma 4.4. *If $a \geq 2$, then $[a]$ has dual $[\overbrace{2, ..., 2}^{a-1}]$. If $n \geq 2$, then $[a_1, a_2, ..., a_n]$ has dual $[m_1, ...m_k] = [\overbrace{2, ..., 2}^{a_1-2}, m_{a_1-1}, ..., m_k]$ and $m_{a_1-1} \neq 2$. By Lemma 4.1, $[a_1, a_2, ..., a_n]$ has dual $[m_1, ...m_k] = [m_1, ..., m_{k-(a_n-2)}, \underbrace{2, ..., 2}_{a_n-2}]$ and $m_{k-(a_n-2)} \neq 2$*

Proof. To prove the first claim, we proceed by induction on a. Clearly $[2]$ has dual $[2]$. Assume $[l]$ has dual $[\overbrace{2, ..., 2}^{l-1}]$. Then, by Lemma 4.3, $[l + 1]$ has dual $[\overbrace{2, ..., 2}^{l}]$. To prove the second claim, let $[a_1, a_2, ..., a_n]$ have dual $[m_1, m_2, ..., m_k]$. We proceed by induction on a_1. Let $a_1 = 2$. Then by Lemma 4.2, $m_{a_1-1} = m_1 \neq 2$. Now assume the claim is true for $a_1 = l$, that is $[l, a_2, ..., a_n]$ has dual $[\overbrace{2, ..., 2}^{l-2}, m_{l-1}, ..., m_k]$ and $m_{l-1} \neq 2$. Then, by Lemma 4.3, $[l + 1, a_2, ..., a_n]$ has dual $[\underbrace{2, ..., 2}_{l-1}, m_{l-1}, ..., m_k]$ and $m_{l-1} \neq 2$, which is the l^{th} entry. □

Lemma 4.5. *Let $[a_1, a_2, ..., a_n]$ have dual $[m_1, ..., m_k]$. Then $[a_2, ..., a_n]$ has dual $[m_{a_1-1}-1, m_{a_1}, ..., m_k]$. By Lemma 4.1, $[a_1, ..., a_{n-1}]$ has dual $[m_1, ..., m_{k-a_n+2} - 1]$.*

Proof. By lemma 4.4, $[a_1, a_2, ..., a_n]$ has dual $[m_1, ..., m_k] = [\overbrace{2, ...2}^{a_1-2}, m_{a_1-1}, ..., m_k]$, where $m_{a_1-1} > 2$. By $a_1 - 2$ applications of Lemma 4.3, we get that $[m_{a_1-1} - 1, m_{a_1}, ..., m_k]$ has dual $[a_1 - (a_1 - 2), a_2, ..., a_n] = [2, a_2, ..., a_n]$ and so, again by Lemma 4.3, $[a_2, ..., a_n]$ has dual $[m_{a_1-1} - 1, m_{a_1}, ..., m_k]$. □

Lemma 4.6. *Let* $[a_1, a_2, ..., a_n]$ *have dual* $[m_1, m_2, ..., m_k]$*. Then* $[a_0, a_1, a_2, ..., a_n]$ *has dual* $[\underbrace{2, ..., 2}_{a_0-2}, m_1 + 1, m_2, ..., m_k]$*, where* $a_0 \geq 2$*. By Lemma 4.1,* $[a_1, a_2, ..., a_n, a_{n+1}]$ *has dual* $[m_1, m_2, ..., m_k + 1, \underbrace{2, ..., 2}_{a_{n+1}-2}]$*, where* $a_{n+1} \geq 2$

Proof. Let $[a_1, a_2, ..., a_n]$ have dual $[m_1, m_2, ..., m_k]$. We proceed by induction on a_0. Let $a_0 = 2$. Then by Lemma 4.3, $[2, a_1, ..., a_n]$ has dual $[m_1 + 1, m_2, ..., m_k]$. Now assume the claim is true for $a_0 = l$, that is $[l, a_1, a_2, ..., a_n]$ has dual $[\overbrace{2, ...2}^{l-2}, m_1 + 1, m_2, ..., m_k]$. Then, again by Lemma 4.3, $[l + 1, a_1, a_2, ..., a_n]$ has dual $[\underbrace{2, ...2}_{l-1}, m_1 + 1, m_2, ..., m_k]$. □

Remark 4.7. Combining the above lemmas, we obtain an algorithm for computing the dual fraction expansion of a given continued fraction expansion. The algorithm is as follows:

Let $\frac{p}{q} = [a_1, ..., a_n]$, where $a_i \geq 2 \ \forall \ 1 \leq i \leq n$.

(1) If $a_1 \neq 2$, then the first/next $a_1 - 2$ entries of the dual fraction expansion are all 2. In this case, change a_1 into 2 and move on to step 2.
(2) If $a_1 = \cdots = a_k = 2$ and $a_{k+1} \neq 2$ for some $1 \leq k < n$, then the new entry in the dual fraction expansion is $k + 2$. In this case, remove $a_1, ..., a_k$ from the sequence and replace a_{k+1} with $a_{k+1} - 1$. If $a_1 = \cdots = a_n = 2$, then the new and final entry in the dual fraction is $n + 1$.
(3) Relabel $a_{k+1} - 1, a_{k+2}, ..., a_n$ as $a_1, a_2, ..., a_n$ and repeat the steps.

Note that this algorithm is equivalent to Riemenschneider's dot diagram.

For a simple example consider $\frac{297}{122} = [3, 2, 5, 2, 2, 6]$. Since this fraction begins with 3, we start the dual fraction with 2 and replace the sequence $(3, 2, 5, 2, 2, 6)$ with $(2, 2, 5, 2, 2, 6)$. Now, this new sequence begins with two entries that are 2, so the next entry in the dual fraction is a 4 and we replace the sequence $(2, 2, 5, 2, 2, 6)$ with $(4, 2, 2, 6)$. Next, this new sequence begins with 4, so the next entries in the dual fraction are two 2s and we replace $(4, 2, 2, 6)$ with $(2, 2, 2, 6)$. Since this new sequence begins with three 2s, the next entry in the dual is (5) and we replace $(2, 2, 2, 6)$ with (5). Our new sequence is (5), so the next three entries of the dual are 2s and we replace (5) with (2). Finally, since our sequence (2) is comprised of all (that is, only one) 2s, the next and final entry of the dual is 2. Putting this all together, we claim that the dual fraction is $[2, 4, 2, 2, 5, 2, 2, 2, 2]$. Indeed, this fraction is $\frac{297}{297-122}$.

4.2. **Properties involving blowups and buddings.** For the next set of lemmas, we will consider fractions in which all entries are positive and in which each denominator appearing in the fraction is nonzero. Such a fraction is called *admissible*. Notice that in order for a fraction $[a_1, ..., a_n]$ to make sense, it must be admissible. In the previous section, since all entries of all continued fractions were at least 2, they were all already admissible. In this section, we'll consider fractions with entries greater or equal to 1. Thus, requiring admissibility is important. For example, $[2, 1, 1]$ is not admissible and is undefined. Moreover, we'll consider admissible fractions $[a_1, ..., a_n]$ that are equal to 0. In this case, there must exist an i such that $a_i = 1$ (see e.g. [11]).

Definition 4.8. Let $[a_1, ..., a_n] = 0$ be admissible. Then the *blowup before* a_i is the fraction $[a_1, ..., a_{i-1}+1, 1, a_i+1, ..., a_n]$ and the *blowup after* a_i is the fraction $[a_1, ..., a_i+1, 1, a_{i+1}+1, ..., a_n]$. If $a_i = 1$, then the *blowdown at* a_i is $[a_1, ..., a_{i-1} - 1, a_{i+1} - 1, ..., a_n]$. By saying $[a_1, ..., a_n]$ is a blowup of $[a'_1, ..., a'_l]$, we mean that $[a_1, ..., a_n]$ is obtained from a sequence of blowups of $[a'_1, ..., a'_l]$. Similarly, $[a'_1, ..., a'_l]$ is a blowdown of $[a_1, ..., a_n]$ if it can be obtained from a sequence of blowdowns of $[a_1, ..., a_n]$.

It is known that if $[a_1, ..., a_n]$ is admissible, then any blowup or blowdown is also admissible, $[a_n, ..., a_1]$ is admissible, and $[a_i, a_{i+1}, ..., a_j]$ is admissible for all $1 \leq i \leq j \leq n$ (see, e.g. [11]). In [8], Lisca proves that all admissible fractions $[a_1, ..., a_n] = 0$ are obtained by a sequence of blowups of [0] and any fraction obtained by a sequence of blowups of [0] is admissible and equal to 0. The only blowup of [0] is [1, 1] and the only two blowups of [1, 1] are [1, 2, 1] and [2, 1, 2]. We will consider fractions obtained by sequences of blowups of these two fractions.

Definition 4.9. The *buddings* of the fraction $[a_1, ..., a_n]$ are the fractions $[a_1 + 1, a_2, ..., a_n, 2]$ and $[2, a_1, ..., a_{n-1}, a_n + 1]$. The *debudding* of $[a_1, ..., a_n]$ is the reverse operation. (Note: to be able to perform a debudding, we must have either $a_1 = 2$ and $a_n > 1$ or $a_1 > 1$ and $a_n = 2$. For example, the debudding of $[2, a_2, ..., a_n]$, where $a_n > 1$, is $[a_2, ..., a_n - 1]$.) Futhermore, by saying $[a_1, ..., a_n]$ is a budding of $[a'_1, ..., a'_l]$, we mean that $[a_1, ..., a_n]$ is obtained from a sequence of buddings of $[a'_1, ..., a'_l]$ and by saying $[a_1, ..., a_n]$ is a debudding of $[a'_1, ..., a'_l]$, we mean that $[a_1, ..., a_n]$ is obtained from a sequence of debuddings of $[a'_1, ..., a'_l]$

Equipped with this definition, a direct consequence of Lemma 4.3 is the following:

Corollary 4.10. *If $[a_1, ..., a_n]$ has dual $[m_1, ..., m_k]$, then a budding of $[a_1, ..., a_n]$ has dual that is a budding of $[m_1, ..., m_k]$. More precisely, $[2, a_1, ..., a_n + 1]$ has dual $[1 + m_1, m_2, ..., m_k, 2]$.*

Lemma 4.11. *Buddings and debuddings of admissible fractions are admissible.*

Proof. Let $[a_1, ..., a_n]$ be admissible. Notice that all denominators in $[2, a_1, ..., a_n + 1]$ are greater than the denominators in $[a_1, ..., a_n]$ and so $[2, a_1, ..., a_n + 1]$ is admissible. By [11], since $[a_1, ..., a_n]$ is admissible, so is $[a_n, ..., a_1]$. Again by considering the denominators, $[2, a_n, ..., a_1 + 1]$ is admissible and so $[a_1 + 1, a_2, ..., a_n, 2]$ is admissible. Now, without loss of generality, suppose $a_1 = 2$ and $a_n > 1$. By appealing once again to [11], $[a_2, ..., a_n - 1]$ is admissible and so $[a_n - 1, ..., a_1]$ is admissible, which implies $[-1 + a_n - 1, ..., a_1]$ is admissible. Thus $[a_2, ..., a_n - 1]$ is admissible. □

Equipped with this fact and the facts of admissibility of blowups and blowdowns in [11], we will not have to check admissibility throughout the remainder of this paper.

Lemma 4.12. *Let $[a_1, ..., a_n] = 0$ be a blowup of $[2, 1, 2]$ with exactly one entry that is 1. Then there is one possible debudding of $[a_1, ..., a_n]$ and it is equal to 0. Furthermore, its buddings $[2, a_1, ..., a_n + 1]$ and $[a_1 + 1, ..., a_n, 2]$ are both 0.*

Proof. We proceed by induction on n. First notice that the only blowups of $[2, 1, 2]$ are $[2, 2, 1, 3] = 0$ and $[3, 1, 2, 2] = 0$. These only have one possible debudding each, namely $[2, 1, 2] = 0$. It is also easy to check that the buddings of both of these fractions are 0. Inductively assume that the lemma is true for all length $n - 1$ fractions satisfying the hypotheses. Let $[a_1, ..., a_n] = 0$ be a blowup of $[2, 1, 2]$ with exactly one entry, a_i, that is 1, where $1 < i \leq n$. Then either $a_1 = 2$ and $a_n > 2$ or $a_1 > 2$ and $a_n = 2$. Also note that in the former case we have $2 < i < n$ and in the latter case we have $1 < i < n - 1$. Thus there is one possible debudding, namely $[a_2, ..., a_n - 1]$ or $[a_1 - 1, ..., a_{n-1}]$. By blowing down at a_i, we obtain a length $n - 1$ fraction $[a_1, ..., a_{i-1} - 1, a_{i+1} - 1, ..., a_n] = 0$ with exactly one entry that is 1, namely either $a_{i-1} = 1$ or $a_{i+1} = 1$.

Now, to prove the first claim, by the inductive hypothesis, $[a_1, ..., a_{i-1} - 1, a_{i+1} - 1, ..., a_n]$ has one debudding and it is equal to 0. Without loss of generality, suppose $a_1 = 2$ and $a_n > 2$ so that the debudding is $[a_2, ..., a_{i-1} - 1, a_{i+1} - 1, ..., a_n - 1] = 0$. Now, perform a blowup either before $a_{i+1} - 1$ if $a_{i+1} - 1 = 1$ or after $a_{i-1} - 1$ if $a_{i-1} - 1 = 1$ to obtain $[a_2, ..., a_n - 1] = 0$.

To prove the second claim, by the inductive hypothesis, we have $[a_1 + 1, ..., a_{i-1} - 1, a_{i+1} - 1, ..., a_n, 2] = 0$ and $[2, a_1, ..., a_{i-1} - 1, a_{i+1} - 1, ..., a_n + 1] = 0$ and so by blowing back up, either before $a_{i+1} - 1$ if $a_{i+1} - 1 = 1$ or after $a_{i-1} - 1$ if $a_{i-1} - 1 = 1$, we have $[a_1 + 1, ..., a_n, 2] = 0$ and $[2, a_1, ..., a_n + 1] = 0$ □

Lemma 4.13. *A fraction* $[a_1, ..., a_n]$ *is a budding of* $[2, 1, 2]$ *if and only if it is a blowup of* $[2, 1, 2]$ *that has exactly one entry that is 1.*

Proof. We will first prove the forward direction by induction on the length of the fraction. Notice that the two buddings of $[2, 1, 2]$ are $[2, 2, 1, 3]$ and $[3, 1, 2, 2]$, which are clearly the blowups of $[2, 1, 2]$ with exactly one entry that is 1. Inductively assume the claim is true for all length $n-1$ fractions that are buddings of $[2, 1, 2]$. Let $[a_1, ..., a_n]$ be obtained by a sequence of buddings of $[2, 1, 2]$. Then we can perform a debudding to obtain a length $n-1$ fraction that is a budding of $[2, 1, 2]$. By the inductive hypothesis, this fraction is a blowup of $[2, 1, 2]$ that has exactly one entry that is 1. Thus, by Lemmas 4.11 and 4.12, $[a_1, ..., a_n] = 0$. Furthermore, $[a_1, ..., a_n]$ has exactly one entry that is 1, since it is a budding of a fraction that has one entry that is 1. Therefore it must be a blowup of $[2, 1, 2]$.

For the converse, suppose $[a_1, ..., a_n] = 0$ is a blowup of $[2, 1, 2]$ that has exactly one entry that is 1. Then in particular, either $a_1 = 2$ and $a_n > 2$ or $a_1 > 2$ and $a_n = 2$. By Lemma 4.12, it's debudding (either $[a_1 - 1, ..., a_{n-1}]$ or $[a_2, ..., a_n - 1]$) is 0. Moreover by Lemma 4.11, it is admissible and thus it must be a blowup of $[2, 1, 2]$. Finally, it must also have precisely one entry that is 1. Thus, if $n - 1 > 3$, then either the first entry is 2 and the last is greater than 2 or the reverse. So, we may apply another debudding and once again use Lemma 4.12. We can continue this process until we obtain $[2, 1, 2]$. Thus $[a_1, ..., a_n]$ is a budding of $[2, 1, 2]$. □

Lemma 4.14. *If* $[a_1, ..., a_n] = 0$ *has* $a_1 = 1$ *or* $a_n = 1$*, then it is a blowup of* $[1, 2, 1]$*.*

Proof. Suppose $[a_1, ..., a_n] = 0$ is a blowup of $[2, 1, 2]$ and without loss of generality assume $a_1 = 1$. Since it is a blowup of $[2, 1, 2]$, there is an $2 < i < n$ such that $a_i = 1$ (note, if $a_2 = 1$, then we would have $[1, 1, a_3, ..., a_n] = 0$ and so $[a_n, ..., a_3, 1, 1] = 0$. But $[1, 1] = 0$ and so $[a_n, ..., a_3, 1, 1]$ is undefined, a contradiction). We will show that by repeatedly blowing down at a_i, we obtain $[1, 2, 1]$. We proceed by induction. Let $n = 4$. Then the fraction must be $[1, 3, 1, 2]$. Blowing down at the third entry, we obtain $[1, 2, 1]$. Now suppose all length $n - 1$ (where $n > 4$) fractions with $a_1 = 1$ that are blowups of $[2, 1, 2]$ are also blowups of $[1, 2, 1]$. Let $[1, a_2, ..., a_n] = 0$ be a blowup of $[2, 1, 2]$ with $a_i = 1$, where $2 < i < n$. Blowing down at a_i, we obtain $[1, a_2, ..., a_{i-1} - 1, a_{i+1} - 1, ..., a_n] = 0$. By the inductive hypothesis, since this is a length $n - 1$ blowup of $[2, 1, 2]$, it is also a blowup of $[1, 2, 1]$. Thus $[a_1, ..., a_n]$ is also a blowup of $[1, 2, 1]$. □

The next lemma is a slight generalization of Lemma 4.12. In it, we allow there to be more than one entry that is 1.

Lemma 4.15. *Suppose* $[a_1, ..., a_n] = 0$ *is a blowup of* $[2, 1, 2] = 0$ *and not a blowup of* $[1, 2, 1]$ *(so in particular by Lemma 4.14,* $a_1, a_n \neq 1$*). Then* $[2, a_1, ..., a_n + 1] = 0$ *and* $[a_1 + 1, ..., a_n, 2] = 0$*.*

Proof. We first show that if $[a_1, ..., a_n] = 0$ is a blowup of $[2, 1, 2]$ and not a blowup of $[1, 2, 1]$, then $[a_1, ..., a_n + 1] = \frac{1}{2}$. We do this by induction on n. First note that $[2, 1, 2] = 0$ and $[2, 1, 3] = \frac{1}{2}$. Now assume this holds for all length $n-1$ blowups of $[2, 1, 2]$ that are not blowups of $[1, 2, 1]$, where $n > 4$. Let $[a_1, ..., a_n] = 0$ be a blowup of $[2, 1, 2]$ that is not a blowup of $[1, 2, 1]$, with $a_i = 1$, where $1 < i < n$. Blowdown at a_i to obtain $[a_1, ..., a_{i-1} - 1, a_{i+1} - 1, ..., a_n] = 0$, which is a blowup of $[2, 1, 2]$ and not a blowup of $[1, 2, 1]$. By the inductive hypothesis, $[a_1, ..., a_{i-1} - 1, a_{i+1} - 1, ..., a_n + 1] = \frac{1}{2}$. Now notice $a_{i-1} - 1 - \dfrac{1}{a_{i+1} - 1} = a_{i-1} - \dfrac{1}{1 - \frac{1}{a_{i+1}}}$. Thus $[a_1, ..., a_{i-1}, a_i, a_{i+1}, ..., a_n + 1] = [a_1, ..., a_{i-1} - 1, a_{i+1} - 1, ..., a_n + 1] = \frac{1}{2}$. So, if $[a_1, ..., a_n] = 0$ is a blowup of $[2, 1, 2]$ but not a blowup of $[1, 2, 1]$, then $[2, a_1, ..., a_n + 1] = 2 - \dfrac{1}{[a_1, ..., a_n + 1]} = 0$. Similarly, $[a_1 + 1, ..., a_n, 2] = 0$ □

Lemma 4.16. *If* $[m_1, ..., m_k]$ *has dual* $[a_1, ..., a_n]$ *and* $[s_1, ..., s_l]$ *has dual* $[b_1, ...b_t]$*, then* $[m_1, ..., m_k, s_1, ..., s_l]$ *has dual* $[a_1, ...a_{n-1}, a_n + b_1 - 1, b_2, ..., b_t]$*.*

Proof. We proceed by induction on k. Let $[s_1, ..., s_l]$ have dual $[b_1, ...b_t]$. Let $m \geq 2$ be an integer, then by Lemma 4.4, $[m]$ has dual $[\overbrace{2, ..., 2}^{m-1}] = [a_1, ..., a_{m-1}]$. Now, by Lemma 4.4 $[m, s_1, ..., s_l]$ has dual $[\overbrace{2, ..., 2}^{m-2}, b_1 + 1, b_2, ..., b_t] = [a_1, ..., a_{m-2}, a_{m-1} + b_1 - 1, b_2, ..., b_t]$. Now, inductively assume the claim holds for all length $k-1$ continued fractions. Now suppose $[m_1, ..., m_k]$ has dual $[a_1, ..., a_n]$. Then $[m_2, ..., m_k]$ has dual $[a_{m_1-1} - 1, ..., a_k]$. By the inductive hypothesis, $[m_2, ..., m_k, s_1, ..., s_l]$ has dual $[a_{m_1-1} - 1, ..., a_{n-1}, a_n + b_1 - 1, b_2, ..., b_t]$. Thus $[m_1, ..., m_k, s_1, ..., s_l]$ has dual $[a_1, ..., a_{n-1}, a_n + b_1 - 1, b_2, ..., b_t]$. □

Lemma 4.17. *Conversely, suppose $[m_1, ..., m_k, s_1, ..., s_l]$ has dual $[a_1, ..., a_n]$. Then $[m_1, ..., m_k]$ and $[s_1, ..., s_l]$ have respective duals $[a_1, ..., a_{i-1}, a_i']$ and $[a_i'', a_{i+1}, ..., a_n]$, where $a_i' + a_i'' - 1 = a_i$ and $1 \leq i \leq n$.*

Proof. We proceed by induction on k. Suppose $[m_1, s_1, ..., s_l]$ has dual $[a_1, ..., a_n] = [\overbrace{2, ..., 2}^{m_1-2}, a_{m_1-1}, ..., a_n]$ (by Lemma 4.4). By Lemma 4.4, $[m_1]$ has dual $[\overbrace{2, ..., 2}^{m_1-1}]$ and $[s_1, ..., s_l]$ has dual $[a_{m_1-1} - 1, ..., a_n]$. Furthermore, $2 + a_{m_1-1} - 1 - 1 = a_{m_1-1}$. Now inductively assume the claim is true for all fractions of length $k-1$. Suppose $[m_1, ..., m_k, s_1, ..., s_l]$ has dual $[a_1, ..., a_n]$. Then $[m_2, ..., m_k, s_1, ..., s_l]$ has dual $[a_{m_1-1} - 1, ..., a_n]$. By the inductive hypothesis, $[m_2, ..., m_k]$ and $[s_1, ..., s_l]$ have respective duals $[a_{m_1-1} - 1, ..., a_{i-1}, a_i']$ and $[a_i'', a_{i+1}, ..., a_n]$, where $a_i' + a_i'' - 1 = a_i$ and $2 \leq i \leq n$. Thus $[m_1, ..., m_k]$ has dual $[a_1, ..., a_{i-1}, a_i']$ and $a_i' + a_i'' - 1 = a_i$. □

5. 2-Replaceable Linear Plumbings – Proof of Theorem 1.5

5.1. **Lisca's Classification.** Let $p > q > 0 \in \mathbb{Z}$ be coprime. Lisca described all minimal (weak) symplectic fillings of $(L(p,q), \xi_{st})$, where ξ_{st} is the standard contact structure on $L(p,q)$, by considering the continued fraction expansion of $\frac{p}{p-q} = [a_1', ..., a_n']$. He proved that any minimal symplectic filling of $(L(p,q), \xi_{st})$ is orientation preserving diffeomorphic to the manifold described by:



where the red -1 framed unknots are the attaching circles of 2-handles attached to $S^1 \times D^3$, whose boundary $S^1 \times S^2$ is given by surgery along the horizontal chain of unlinks, where $[a_1, ..., a_n] = 0$ is an admissible fraction with $a_i \leq a_i'$ for all $1 \leq i \leq n$. Note that since this filling is obtained from $S^1 \times D^3$ by attaching $\sum_{i=1}^{k}(a_i' - a_i)$ 2-handles, it has Euler characteristic $\sum_{i=1}^{k}(a_i' - a_i)$.

Recall that 1-replaceable linear plumbings are obtained by sequences of buddings of -4. By Lisca's classification, if $[b_1, ..., b_k]$ is a budding of 4, then its dual must be of the form $[a_1, ..., a_i + 1, ..., a_n]$, where $[a_1, ..., a_i, ..., a_n] = 0$ is a blowup of $[2, 1, 2]$ with exactly one entry that is 1, namely a_i, where $1 < i < n$.

Throughout this section any continued fraction $[a_1, ..., a_n] = 0$ is assumed to be admissible with at most two entries that are 1. Suppose $a_i = a_j = 1$ are the only entries that are equal to 1. If $i \neq j$, then $[a_1, ...a_i + 1, ..., a_j + 1, ..., a_n] = \frac{p}{p-q}$ describes an Euler characteristic 2 symplectic filling of $(L(p,q), \xi_{st})$ (as above) and if $i = j$, then $[a_1 + 1, ...a_i + 1, ..., a_n] = \frac{p_1}{p_1 - q_1}$, $[a_1, a_2 + 1, ..., a_i + 1, ..., a_n] =$

$\frac{p_2}{p_2-q_2}, ..., [a_1, ...a_i+2, ..., a_n] = \frac{p_i}{p_i-q_i}, ..., [a_1, ...a_i+1, ..., a_n+1] = \frac{p_n}{p_n-q_n}$ describe Euler characteristic 2 symplectic fillings of $(L(p_1, q_1), \xi_{st}), ..., (L(p_n, q_n), \xi_{st})$, respectively.

On the other hand, given the continued fraction expansion of $\frac{p}{p-q}$, the dual fraction expansion of $\frac{p}{q}$ corresponds to a linear plumbing that is also a symplectic filling of $(L(p, q), \xi_{st})$. That is, if $\frac{p}{q} = [m_1, ..., m_r]$, then the plumbing:



is a symplectic filling of $(L(p, q), \xi_{st})$.

Putting these facts together, the linear plumbing corresponding to $\frac{p}{q}$ is 2-replaceable if and only if it has dual $\frac{p}{p-q}$ of one of the following forms:

(1) $[a_1, ..., a_i + 1, ..., a_j + 1, ..., a_n]$, where $a_i = 1, a_j \neq 1$ and $[a_1, ..., a_i, ..., a_j, ..., a_n] = 0$ has exactly one entry that is 1 and is a blowup of $[1, 1]$.
(2) $[a_1, ..., a_i + 2, ..., a_n]$, where $a_i = 1$ and $[a_1, ..., a_i, ..., a_n] = 0$ has exactly one entry that is 1 and is a blowup of $[1, 1]$.
(3) $[a_1, ..., a_i+1, ..., a_j+1, ..., a_n]$, where $a_i = a_j = 1$ and $[a_1, ..., a_i, ..., a_j, ..., a_n] = 0$ has exactly two entries that are 1 and is a blowup of $[1, 1]$.

5.2. **Proof of Theorem 1.5.** For convenience, we recall Theorem 1.5:

Theorem 1.5 *Let $(-b_1, ..., -b_k)$ and $(-c_1, ..., -c_l)$ be obtained by sequences of buddings of -4 and let $z \geq 2$ be any integer. Then a linear plumbing is 2-replaceable if and only if it is either degenerate and thus of the form:*

(a) 

for $k, l \geq 0$

or is obtained by a sequence of buddings of one of the linear plumbings of the form:

(b) 

for $k \geq 0$.

(c) 

(d) 

for $k, l \geq 1$

We first show that all plumbings listed in the theorem are indeed 2-replaceable. The linear plumbings of type (a) are degenerate, since the "subplumbings" on either side of the $-z$-disk bundle can be rationally blown down, revealing an Euler characteristic 2 manifold. Moreover, since rational blowdowns are symplectic [18], the new manifold is also a strong symplectic filling of the boundary lens space equipped with the standard contact structure. So the plumbings of type (a) are 2-replaceable. Buddings of plumbings of type (b), (c) and (d) can also be seen to be 2-replaceable via rational blowdowns. Given the usual handlebody diagram of (a budding of) a plumbing of type (b) or (c), it can be shown that a simple handle slide (or no handle slide) reveals a 1-replaceable linear plumbing of length one less than the plumbing in question. This plumbing can then be rationally blown down, leaving an Euler characteristic 2 manifold. For (a budding of) a plumbing of type (d), one could blowup the intersection between the $-b_k$- and $-c_1$-spheres multiple times in such a way that reveals two 1-replaceable linear plumbings that are plumbed to a -1-sphere. After rationally blowing these down, we are left with an Euler characteristic 2 manifold. Instead of proving these details, we will use Lisca's classification and work case by case (which is quicker).

Type (b): Suppose $[b_1, ..., b_k]$ is a budding of 4. Then it has dual of the form $[a_1, ..., a_i+1, ..., a_n]$, where $[a_1, ..., a_i, ..., a_n] = 0$ has exactly one entry that is equal to 1, namely a_i, where $i \neq 1, n$. By Lemma 4.3, $[b_1, ..., b_k, 2]$ has dual $[a_1, ..., a_i + 1, ..., a_n + 1]$ and so the plumbing corresponding to $[b_1, ..., b_k, 2]$ is 2-replaceable. Now let $[m_1, ..., m_r]$ be a budding of $[b_1, ..., b_k, 2]$. Then, by Corollary 4.10, it has dual that is a budding of $[a_1, ..., a_i + 1, ..., a_n + 1]$. Call this dual $[a_{-j}, ..., a_0, a_1 + 1 + t, a_2, ..., a_i + 1, ..., a_n + s, a_{n+1}, ..., a_{n+m}]$, for some $j, m, s, t \geq 0$. By Lemmas 4.12 and 4.13, $[a_{-j}, ..., a_0, a_1 + t, a_2, ..., a_i, ..., a_n + s, a_{n+1}, ..., a_{n+m}] = 0$ is a blowup of $[2, 1, 2]$ with exactly one entry equal to 1. Thus, the plumbing corresponding to $[m_1, ..., m_r]$ is 2-replaceable.

Type (c): By a similar argument, it is clear that any budding of $[3, 3]$ is 2-replaceable.

Type (d): Let $[b_1, ..., b_k]$ have dual $[a_1, ..., a_i+1, ..., a_n]$, where $a_i = 1$ and $[a_1, ..., a_i, ..., a_n] = 0$ is a blowup of $[2, 1, 2]$ with exactly one entry that is 1, and let $[c_1, ..., c_l]$ have dual $[a'_1, ..., a'_j+1, ..., a'_m]$, where $a'_j = 1$ and $[a'_1, ..., a'_j, ..., a'_m] = 0$ is a blowup of $[2, 1, 2]$ with exactly one entry that is 1. Then, by the proof of Lemma 4.15, $[a'_1, ..., a'_j, ..., a'_m + 1] = \frac{1}{2}$ and so $[a_n + a'_1 - 1, a'_2..., a'_j, ..., a'_m + 1] = a_n - 1 + \frac{1}{2} = a_n - \frac{1}{2}$. Furthermore, by Lemma 4.15, $[a_1 + 1, ..., a_i, ..., a_{n-1}, a_n, 2] = 0$ and so $[a_1, ..., a_i, ..., a_{n-1}, a_n - \frac{1}{2}] = [a_1, ..., a_i, ..., a_{n-1}, a_n, 2] = -1$. Thus $[a_1, ..., a_i, ..., a_{n-1}, a_n + a'_1 - 1, a'_2, ..., a'_j, ..., a'_m+1] = -1$. By Lemma 4.16, $[b_1, ..., b_k, c_1, ..., c_l]$ has dual $[a_1, ..., a_i+1, ..., a_{n-1}, a_n+a'_1 - 1, a'_2, ..., a'_j + 1, ..., a'_m]$ and so, by Lemma 4.3, $[2, b_1, ..., b_k, c_1, ..., c_l, 2]$ has dual $[a_1 + 1, ..., a_i + 1, ..., a_{n-1}, a_n+a'_1-1, a'_2, ..., a'_j+1, ..., a'_m+1]$. Now, $[a_1+1, ..., a_i, ..., a_{n-1}, a_n+a'_1-1, a'_2, ..., a'_j, ..., a'_m+1] = 1 + [a_1, ..., a_i, ..., a_{n-1}, a_n + a'_1 - 1, a'_2, ..., a'_j, ..., a'_m + 1] = 1 - 1 = 0$. Thus, the plumbing corresponding to$[2, b_1, ..., b_k, c_1, ..., c_l, 2]$ is 2-replaceable. Now, suppose $[m_1, ..., m_r]$ is a budding of $[2, b_1, ..., b_k, c_1, ..., c_l, 2]$. Then, by Corollary 4.10, $[m_1, ..., m_r]$ has dual that is a budding of $[a_1 + 1, ..., a_i + 1, ..., a_{n-1}, a_n + a'_1 - 1, a'_2, ..., a'_j + 1, ..., a'_m + 1]$. By a similar argument as in the previous cases, with an application of Lemma 4.15, the plumbing corresponding to $[m_1, ..., m_r]$ is 2-replaceable.

We have shown that all linear plumbings of Theorem 1.5 are indeed 2-replaceable. Next we show that these are the only 2-replaceable linear plumbings. To do this we consider all possible admissible continued fractions $[a_1, ..., a_n] = 0$ with at most two entries equal to 1 and show that the linear plumbings corresponding to their dual fractions are of one of the forms in Theorem 1.5.

We start with the trivial cases. If $n = 1$, then the only admissible fraction that is equal to 0 is $[0]$. Adding 2 gives the fraction $[2] = \frac{2}{1}$, which has dual fraction $[2] = \frac{2}{1}$. This corresponds to the -2 disk bundle over S^2. If $n = 2$, then the only such fraction is $[1, 1]$. Adding 1 to each entry gives $[2, 2] = \frac{3}{2}$, which has dual fraction 3. This corresponds to the -3 disk bundle over S^2. More generally, consider $[1, \overbrace{2, 2, ..., 2, 2}^{p}, 1] = 0$, where $p \geq 0$. Adding 1 to the first and last entry gives $[2, 2, ..., 2, 2] = \frac{p+3}{p+2}$, which has dual fraction $p + 3$. This corresponds to the $-(p + 3)$ disk bundle over S^2. These cases already have Euler characteristic 2, thus they are trivially 2-replaceable.

We now assume that $[a_1, ..., a_n] = 0$ has at most two entries that are equal to 1, $n \geq 3$, and a_1, a_n are not both 1. Notice that the only admissible fractions equal to 0 of length 3 are $[1, 2, 1]$ and $[2, 1, 2]$. Thus $[a_1, ..., a_n]$ is a blowup of one of these two fractions. We need to consider the following cases:

(1) Blowups of $[1, 2, 1]$ with exactly two entries that are 1. (Note, no blowup of $[1, 2, 1]$ can contain exactly one entry that is 1)
   - Blowups with $a_1 = 1$ and $a_n \neq 1$ (and equivalently, with $a_n = 1$ and $a_1 \neq 1$)
   - Blowups with $a_1, a_n \neq 1$

(2) Blowups of $[2,1,2]$ that are not blowups of $[1,2,1]$. By Lemma 4.14, such blowups have first and last entry not equal to 1.
- Blowups with exactly one entry that is 1 (Note: these are automatically not blowups of $[1,2,1]$)
- Blowups with exactly two entries that are 1

Lemma 5.1. *Suppose $[a_1,...,a_n]=0$ is a blowup of $[1,2,1]$ with $a_1=1$ and $a_i=1$, where $1<i<n$. Then $[a_1+1,...,a_i+1,...,a_n]$ has dual of the form $[z,b_1,...,b_k]$, where $[b_1,...,b_k]$ is a budding of 4 and $z\geq 3$. Thus, any linear plumbing gotten this way is of type (a).*

Proof. Let $[a_1,...,a_i,...,a_n]=0$ be as in the statement of the lemma. First notice that since $n\geq 3$, $i\neq 2$. Otherwise, $[a_1,...,a_n]=[1,1,a_3,...,a_n]=0$ and so $[a_n,...,a_3,1,1]=0$. But, $[1,1]=0$ and so $[a_n,...,a_3,1,1]$ is undefined, giving a contradiction. Next, we claim that there exists $2\leq j<i$ such that $a_j\geq 3$. Assume otherwise, so that for all $2\leq j<i$, $a_j=2$. Then the fraction is $[1,2,...,2,1,a_{i+1},...,a_n]=0$. Thus $[a_n,...,a_{i+1},1,2,...,2,1]=0$. But $[1,2,...,2,1]=0$ and so $[a_n,...,a_{i+1},1,2,...,2,1]$ is undefined, a contradiction. Let a_j be the first element such that $a_j\geq 3$. Then $a_2=a_3=...=a_{j-1}=2$ and $j<i$. Now blowdown repeatedly at the first entry until we obtain $[a_j-1,...,a_i,...,a_n]=0$. This fraction has exactly one entry that is 1, namely a_i. Thus it is a blowup of $[2,1,2]$ and so $[a_j-1,...,a_i+1,...,a_n]$ has dual, say $[b_1,...,b_k]$, that is a budding of 4. By Lemma 4.3, $[a_j,...,a_i+1,...,a_n]$ has dual $[2,b_1,...,b_k]$ and so $[a_1+1,...,a_j,...,a_i+1,...,a_n]=[\underbrace{2,...,2}_{j-1},a_j,...,a_i,...,a_n]$ has dual $[j+1,b_1,...,b_k]$, where $j+1\geq 3$. □

Corollary 5.2. *Suppose $[a_1,...,a_n]=0$ is a blowup of $[1,2,1]$ with $a_n=1$ and $a_i=1$, where $1<i<n$. Then $[a_1,...,a_i+1,...,a_n+1]$ has dual of the form $[b_1,...,b_k,z]$, where $[b_1,...,b_k]$ is a budding of 4. Thus, any linear plumbing gotten this way is of type (a).*

Proof. Let $[a_1,...,a_n]=0$ be of the form described in the corollary. Then $[a_n,...,a_1]=0$. By Lemma 5.1, we have that $[a_n+1,...,a_i+1,...,a_1]$ has dual $[z,b_k,...,b_1]$, where $[b_k,...,b_1]$ is a budding of 4. Thus, by Lemma 4.1, the dual of $[a_1,...,a_i+1,...,a_n+1]$ is $[b_1,...,b_k,z]$, where $[b_1,...,b_k]$ is again a blowup of 4 and $z\geq 3$. □

Lemma 5.3. *Let $[a_1,...,a_n]=0$ be a blowup of $[1,2,1]$ such that $a_i=a_j=1$, where $1<i<j<n$. Then $[a_1,...,a_i+1,...,a_j+1,...,a_n]$ has dual $[c_1,...,c_l,z,b_1,...,b_k]$, where $[c_1,...,c_l]$ and $[b_1,...,b_k]$ are buddings of 4 and $z\geq 2$. Thus, any linear plumbing gotten this way is of type (a).*

Proof. Let $[a_1,...,a_n]=0$ be as in the statement of the lemma. Then it can be repeatedly blown down at the first occurrence of 1 until it is of the form $[1,a_r-m,...,a_n]=0$, for some $r<j$ and $m\leq a_r-2$. Note that such values for r and m can be realized since otherwise, if $r=j$ or $a_r-m=1$, we obtain contradictions similar to the contradictions reached in the proof of Lemma 5.1. Assume that this sequence of blowdowns is minimal in the sense that once we have a fraction beginning with 1, we stop blowing down (for example, if $a_r-m=2$, one could blowdown at the first entry to obtain another fraction of this form). By Lemma 5.1, we know that $[2,a_r-m,...,a_j+1,...,a_n]$ has dual $[z,b_1,...,b_k]$ for some $z\geq 3$ and where $[b_1,...,b_k]$ is a budding of 4. To recover the original fraction, we now perform blowups. Note that the first blowup must be after the first entry, since otherwise, we obtain $[1,2,a_r-m,...,a_n]$, which contradicts the minimality assumption. Thus, the first blowup yields $[2,1,a_r-m+1,...a_n]=0$. Now, by Lemma 4.3, $[a_r-m,...,a_j+1,...,a_n]$ has dual $[z-1,b_1,...,b_k]$ and so $[a_r-m+1,...,a_j+1,...,a_n]$ has dual $[2,z-1,b_1,...,b_k]$ and so $[2,2,a_r-m+1,...,a_j+1,...,a_n]$ has dual $[4,z-1,b_1,...,b_k]$. Writing $[2,2,a_r-m+1,...,a_j+1,...,a_n]$ as $[2,2,2+(a_r-m-1),...,a_j+1,...,a_n]$, we can think of $[2,2,2]$ as a "subfraction" of $[2,2,a_r-m+1,...,a_j+1,...,a_n]$. Furthermore, note that 4 has dual $[2,2,2]$.

Now, blowup $[2,1,a_r-m+1,...a_n]=0$ repeatedly before or after the first occurrence of 1 to recover the original fraction $[a_1,...,a_i,...,a_r,...,a_j,...,a_n]=[a_1,...,a_i,...,m+1+(a_r-m-$

$1), ..., a_j, ..., a_n] = 0$. Note that by doing this, we also end up blowing up $[2, 1, 2]$, considered a subfraction, before or after the only entry that is 1 to obtain $[a_1, ..., a_i, ..., a_{r-1}, m + 1]$, which we may consider as a subfraction of $[a_1, ..., a_i, ..., a_r, ..., a_j, ..., a_n]$. Thus, $[a_1, ..., a_i+1, ..., a_{r-1}, m+1]$ has dual that is a budding of 4, call it $[c_1, ..., c_l]$. Since $[a_r - m, ..., a_j + 1, ..., a_n]$ has dual $[z-1, b_1, ..., b_k]$, by Lemma 4.16, $[a_1, ..., a_i + 1, ..., a_r, ..., a_j + 1, ..., a_n]$ has dual $[c_1, ..., c_k, z - 1, b_1, ..., b_k]$, where $z - 1 \geq 2$. □

Lemma 5.4. *Let $[a_1, ..., a_n] = 0$ be a blowup of $[2, 1, 2]$ with exactly one entry that is 1, called a_i (where $1 < i < n$). If $j \neq i$, then $[a_1, ..., a_i + 1, ..., a_j + 1, ..., a_n]$ has dual that is a budding of either $[2, b_1, ..., b_k]$ or $[b_1, ..., b_k, 2]$, where $[b_1, ..., b_k]$ is a budding of 4. If $i = j$, then $[a_1, ..., a_i + 2, ..., a_n]$ has dual that is a budding of $[3, 3]$. Thus any linear plumbing gotten this way is of type (b) or (c).*

Proof. Suppose $j < i$. Since $[a_1, ..., a_n] = 0$ is a blowup of $[2, 1, 2]$ with a_i the only entry that is 1, we can also view it as a budding of $[2, 1, 2]$, by Lemma 4.13. Furthermore, we can view a_i as the image of 1 after performing the sequence of buddings of $[2, 1, 2]$ to obtain $[a_1, ..., a_n]$. Thus, we can perform debuddings until we obtain $[a_j, ..., a_i, ..., a'_l]$ (which is 0 by Lemma 4.13), where $i < l \leq n$ and $a'_l \leq a_l$. Now, $[a_j, ..., a_i + 1, ...a'_l]$ has dual that is a budding of 4, call it $[b_1, ..., b_k]$. Thus, by Lemma 4.3, $[a_j + 1, ..., a_i + 1, ...a'_l]$ has dual $[2, b_1, ..., b_k]$. By performing buddings to recover the original fraction, by Corollary 4.10, we have that $[a_1, ..., a_j + 1, ..., a_i + 1, ..., a_n]$ has dual that is a budding of $[2, b_1, ..., b_k]$. Similarly, if $j > i$, then $[a_1, ..., a_i + 1, ..., a_j + 1, ..., a_n]$ has dual that is a budding of $[c_1, ..., c_l, 2]$, where $[c_1, ..., c_l]$ is a budding of 4.

Now suppose $j = i$. We proceed by induction on n. The only such fraction of length 3 is $[2, 3, 2]$, which has dual $[3, 3]$. Now assume every length $n - 1$ fraction satisfying the hypotheses has dual that is a budding of $[3, 3]$. Let $[a_1, ..., a_n] = 0$ be a blowup of $[2, 1, 2]$ with $a_i = 1$ and $i \neq 1, n$. Without loss of generality, assume $a_1 = 2$ and so $a_n > 2$. Then perform a debudding to obtain $[a_2, ..., a_n - 1] = 0$, by Lemma 4.12. Note that $i \neq 2$, since by Lemma 4.13, this fraction is a blowup of $[2, 1, 2]$ with precisely one entry that is 1. Thus $i > 2$, and so by the inductive hypothesis, $[a_2, ..., a_i + 2, ..., a_n - 1]$ has dual that is a budding of $[3, 3]$, call it $[m_1, ..., m_k]$. By Corollary 4.10, $[a_1, ..., a_i + 2, ..., a_n]$ has dual $[m_1 + 1, ..., m_k, 2]$, which is also a budding of $[3, 3]$. □

Lemma 5.5. *Let $[a_1, ..., a_n] = 0$ be a blowup of $[2, 1, 2]$ and not a blowup of $[1, 2, 1]$ with exactly two entries that are 1. Call them $a_i = a_j = 1$ with $i < j$ (and $i, j \neq 1, n$). Then $[a_1, ..., a_i + 1, ..., a_j + 1, ..., a_n]$ has dual that is a budding of $[2, b_1, ..., b_k, c_1, ..., c_l, 2]$, where $[b_1, ..., b_k]$ and $[c_1, ...c_l]$ are buddings of 4. Thus linear plumbings gotten this way are of type (d).*

Proof. Note that the minimal length of such a continued fraction is 5 and the only such fraction of length 5 is $[3, 1, 3, 1, 3] = 0$. Clearly $[3, 2, 3, 2, 3]$ has dual $[2, 4, 4, 2]$. Also notice that $[2, 4, 4, 2]$ is the minimal length dual fraction of the desired form. We start by considering blowups of $[3, 1, 3, 1, 3]$. Let $[a_1, ..., a_i, ..., a_{n-2}, 1, 3] = 0$ with $a_i = 1$ and $1 < i < n - 2$ be obtained by a sequence of blowups of $[3, 1, 3, 1, 3]$ before or after the first instance of 1. Then $a_1, a_{n-2} \geq 3$. Blow down $[a_1, ..., a_i, ..., a_{n-2}, 1, 3]$ at the second occurrence of 1 to obtain $[a_1, ..., a_i, ..., a_{n-2} - 1, 2] = 0$. Next, perform a debudding to obtain $[a_1-1, ..., a_i, ..., a_{n-2}-1]$, which is 0 by Lemma 4.13. Since $a_1, a_{n-2} \geq 3$, this fraction contains exactly one 1, namely a_i, and so $[a_1 - 1, ..., a_i + 1, ..., a_{n-2} - 1]$ has dual that is a budding of 4. Blowing up either before or after a_i yields fractions with exactly one entry that is 1 and so, again, $[a_1 - 1, ..., a_{i-1} + 1, 2, a_i + 1, ..., a_{n-2} - 1]$ and $[a_1 - 1, ..., a_i + 1, 2, a_{i+1} + 1, ..., a_{n-2} - 1]$ have duals that are buddings of 4. Without loss of generality, pick the former and call its dual $[b_1, ..., b_k]$. By Lemmas 4.3 and 4.6, $[a_1, ..., a_{i-1} + 1, 2, a_i + 1, ..., a_{n-2}, 2, 3]$ has dual $[2, b_1, ..., b_k, 4, 2]$. Thus, any fraction obtained by a sequence of blowups of $[3, 1, 3, 1, 3]$ before or after the first instance of 1, is of the form $[2, b_1, ..., b_k, 4, 2]$, where $[b_1, ..., b_k]$ is a budding of 4.

Now let $[a_1, ..., a_i, ..., a_j, ..., a_n] = 0$ be a blowup of $[3, 1, 3, 1, 3]$ with precisely two entries that are 1, namely a_i and a_j. Notice that we can order the blowups so that we first perform all blowups before or after the first occurrence of 1 and then all blowups before or after the second occurrence of

1 to obtain $[a_1, ..., a_i, ..., a_j, ..., a_n] = 0$. After performing all blowups of the former type, we obtain a fraction of the form $[a_1, ..., a_i, ..., a'_m, 1, 3] = 0$, where $a_i = 1$, $1 < i < m$, and $a'_m \leq a_m$. Thus, by the previous paragraph, $[a_1, ..., a_i + 1, ..., a'_m, 2, 3]$ has dual $[2, b_1, ..., b_k, 4, 2]$, where $[b_1, ..., b_k]$ is a budding of 4. Furthermore, by Lemma 4.3, $[a_1, ..., a_i + 1, ..., a'_m - 1]$ has dual $[2, b_1, ..., b_k]$. Now, blow up $[a_1, ..., a_i, ..., a'_m, 1, 3] = 0$ repeatedly before or after the second occurrence of 1 to obtain the original fraction $[a_1, ..., a_i, ...a_{m-1}, a_m, ..., a_j, ..., a_n] = 0$. Since $a_n \geq 3$, by Lemma 4.2, $[a_m - a'_m + 2, a_{m+1}, ..., a_j + 1, ..., a_n]$ has dual of the form $[c_1, ..., c_l, 2]$ for some sequence $(c_1, ..., c_l)$. By Lemma 4.16, since $[a_1, ..., a_i + 1, ..., a'_m - 1]$ has dual $[2, b_1, ..., b_k]$, we have that $[a_1, ..., a_i + 1, ...a_{m-1}, a_m, a_{m+1}..., a_j+1, ..., a_n] = [a_1, ..., a_i+1, ...a_{m-1}, (a'_m-1)+(a_m-a'_m+2)-1, a_{m+1}, ..., a_j+1, ..., a_n]$ has dual $[2, b_1, ..., b_k, c_1, ..., c_l, 2]$. It remains to show that $[c_1, ..., c_l]$ is a budding of 4. To do this, we will show that its dual $[a_m - a'_m + 2, a_{m+1}, ..., a_j + 1, ..., a_n - 1]$, which has exactly one entry equal to 1, is a blowup of $[2, 1, 2]$. First recall that $[a_1, ..., a_i+1, ..., a'_m, 2, 3]$ has dual $[2, b_1, ..., b_k, 4, 2]$. By writing $[a_1, ..., a_i + 1, ..., a'_m, 2, 3]$ as $[a_1, ..., a_i + 1, ..., (a'_m - 2) + 2, 2, 3]$, we can view $[2, 2, 3]$ as a subfraction of $[a_1, ..., a_i+1, ..., a'_m, 2, 3]$. By Lemma 4.17, $[a_1, ..., a_i+1, ..., a'_m-1]$ has dual $[2, b_1, ..., b_k]$ and $[2, 2, 3]$ has dual $[4, 2]$. To obtain $[a_1, ..., a_i, ..., a_m, ..., a_j, ..., a_n] = 0$, we must perform a sequence of blowups before or after the second occurrence of 1 in $[a_1, ..., a_i, ..., a'_m, 1, 3] = 0$. Note that by doing this, we also end up blowing up $[2, 1, 3]$, considered as a subfraction, before or after the only entry that is 1, to obtain $[a_m - a'_m + 2, a_{m+1}, ..., a_j, ..., a_n]$. Thus, $[a_m - a'_m + 2, a_{m+1}, ..., a_j, ..., a_n - 1]$ is a blowup of $[2, 1, 2]$.

Now suppose $[a_1, ..., a_n]$ is as in the statement of the lemma. Since $[a_1, ..., a_n]$ is not a blowup of $[1, 2, 1]$, the only way to obtain $[a_1, ..., a_n]$ through blowups of $[2, 1, 2]$ is to first blowup $[2, 1, 2]$ before or after the middle entry. This gives $[3, 1, 2, 2]$ or $[2, 2, 1, 3]$. Furthermore, at each step, we cannot blowup at the beginning or end of the fraction (otherwise, we obtain a fraction with first or last entry 1 and thus it is a blowup of $[1, 2, 1]$, by Lemma 4.14). Thus either the first or last entry of $[a_1, ..., a_n]$ must be at least 3.

Next, we claim that if $a_1, a_n > 2$, then $[a_1, ..., a_n] = 0$ is a blowup of $[3, 1, 3, 1, 3]$. To see this, first blowdown $[a_1, ..., a_n]$ until it is of minimal length in the sense that it has exactly two entries that are 1 (and with first and last entry not equal to 1, since it is not a blowup of $[1, 2, 1]$) and that if we blowdown at either instance of 1, we then obtain a fraction with only one entry that is 1. This is possible, since after sufficiently many blowdowns, we must obtain $[2, 1, 2]$. With abuse of notation, call this blowdown $[a_1, ..., a_n]$ with $a_i = a_j = 1$ for $i, j \neq 1, n$ and $i \neq j$. If we blowdown at a_i and then at a_j, we must have exactly one entry that is 1 (since the resulting fraction is still a blowup of $[2, 1, 2]$). This can only happen if $a_{i-1}, a_{j+1} > 2$, $i = j - 2$, and $a_{i+1} = a_{j-1} = 3$. That is, the fraction is of the form $[a_1, ..., a_{i-1}, 1, 3, 1, a_{j+1}, ..., a_n] = 0$ with $a_{i-1}, a_{j+1} > 2$. Thus blowing down at a_i gives $[a_1, ..., a_{i-1} - 1, 2, 1, a_{j+1}, ..., a_n] = 0$ and so $[a_1, ..., a_{i-1} - 1, 2, 2, a_{j+1}, ..., a_n]$ has dual $[d_1, ..., d_k]$, which is a budding of 4. If $i - 1 \neq 1$, then since $a_1, a_n > 2$, we have $d_1 = d_k = 2$, by Lemma 4.2. But no such budding of 4 exists. Thus $i - 1 = 1$. Similarly, $j + 1 = n$. Thus $[a_1, ..., a_i, 1, 3, 1, a_j, ..., a_n] = [a_1, 1, 3, 1, a_n] = 0$. The only such continued fraction is $[3, 1, 3, 1, 3]$. Thus, if $[a_1, ..., a_i, ..., a_j, ..., a_n] = 0$ has $a_1, a_n > 2$, then it is a blowup of $[3, 1, 3, 1, 3]$ and thus $[a_1, ..., a_i+1, ..., a_j+1, ..., a_n]$ has dual of the form $[2, b_1, ..., b_k, c_1, ..., c_l, 2]$, where $[b_1, ..., b_k], [c_1, ..., c_l]$ are buddings of 4.

Finally, suppose $[a_1, ..., a_n] = 0$, with $a_i = a_j = 1$, $i \neq j$, $a_1 = 2$, and $a_n > 2$ (or, similarly $a_1 > 2$ and $a_n = 2$). We claim that by a sequence of debuddings, we can obtain a fraction that is a blowup of $[3, 1, 3, 1, 3]$. The first debudding yields $[a_2, ..., a_n - 1]$. If $a_2, a_n - 1 > 2$, then by the previous paragraph, we are done. If $a_2 = 2$ and $a_n - 1 > 2$ (or vice versa), then perform another debudding. Since the fraction has finite length, this process terminates, yielding a fraction with first and last entry greater than 2 (they cannot both be 2 by the remarks above). So the result is a blowup $[3, 1, 3, 1, 3]$. Call this fraction $[a'_1, ..., a'_m]$, with $a'_i = a'_j = 1$, $i \neq j$, and $i, j \neq 1, n$. Then $[a'_1, ..., a'_i+1, ..., a'_j+1, ..., a'_m]$ has dual of the form $[2, b_1, ..., b_k, c_1, ..., c_l, 2]$, where $[b_1, ..., b_k], [c_1, ..., c_l]$ are buddings of 4. Now we can perform buddings to $[a'_1, ..., a'_i + 1, ..., a'_j + 1, ..., a'_m]$, to obtain the

original fraction $[a_1, ..., a_i + 1, ..., a_j + 1, ..., a_n]$. By Corollary 4.10, its dual fraction is obtained by a sequence of buddings of $[2, b_1, ..., b_k, c_1, ..., c_l, 2]$. □

We have exhausted all possibilities and thus have proved Theorem 1.5.

References

[1] Mohan Bhupal and Burak Özbağci. Symplectic fillings of lens spaces as Lefschetz fibrations. *Journal of the European Mathematical Society*, 18(7):1515–1535, 2016.

[2] Andrew Casson and John Harer. Some homology lens spaces which bound rational homology balls. *Pacific Journal of Mathematics*, 96(1):23–36, 1981.

[3] Hisaaki Endo, Thomas E. Mark, and Jeremy Van Horn-Morris. Monodromy substitutions and rational blowdowns. *Journal of Topology 4*, 360:227–253, 2011.

[4] John Etnyre. Planar open book decompositions and contact structures. *International Mathematics Research Notices*, pages 4255–4267, 2004.

[5] Ronald Fintushel and Ronald J. Stern. Rational blowdowns of smooth 4-manifolds. *Journal of Differential Geometry*, 46(2):181–235, 1997.

[6] David Gay and Thomas E. Mark. Convex plumbings and Lefschetz fibrations. *Journal of Symplectic Geometry*, 11(3):363–375, 2013.

[7] Peter Kronheimer, Tomasz Mrowka, Peter Oszváth, and Zoltán Szabó. Monopoles and lens space surgeries. *Annals of Mathematics (2)*, 165(2):457–546, 2007.

[8] Paolo Lisca. On symplectic fillings of lens spaces. *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society*, 360:765–799, 2008.

[9] Maria Michalogiorgaki. Rational blow-down along Wahl type plumbing trees of spheres. *Algebraic and Geometric Topology*, 7:1327–1343, 2007.

[10] Hiroshi Ohta and Kaoru Ono. Simple singularities and topology of symplectically filling 4-manifold. *Comment. Math. Helv.*, 74:575–590, 1999.

[11] Peter Orlik and Philip Wagreich. Algebraic surfaces with k^*-action. *Acta Mathematics*, 138(1):43–81, 1977.

[12] Heesang Park, Jongil Park, Dongsoo Shin, and Giancarlo Urzúa. Milnor fibers and symplectic fillings of quotient surface singularities. *preprint*, 2016.

[13] Jongil Park. Seiberg-Witten invariants of generalised rational blow-downs. *Bull. Austral. Math. Soc.*, 56:363–384, 1997.

[14] Jongil Park. Simply connected symplectic 4-manifolds with $b_2^+ = 1$ and $c_1^2 = 2$. *Inventiones Mathematicae*, 159(3):657–667, 2005.

[15] Olga Plamenevskaya. Contact structures with distinct Heegaard Floer invariants. *Mathematical Research Letters*, 11(4):547–561, 2004.

[16] András Stipsicz and Zoltán Szabó. An exotic smooth structure on $\mathbb{C}P^2\#6\overline{\mathbb{C}P}^2$. *Geometry and Topology*, 9:813–832, 2005.

[17] András Stipsicz, Zoltán Szabó, and Jonathan Wahl. Rational blow-downs and smoothing of surface singularities. *Journal of Topology*, 1(2):477–517, 2008.

[18] Margaret Symington. Symplectic rational blowdowns. *Journal of Differential Geometry*, 50(3):505–518, 1998.